

8
FEB 26 '42

The American Quarterly on the SOVIET UNION

Vol. I

APRIL, 1938

No. 1



Published by

THE AMERICAN RUSSIAN INSTITUTE, Inc.

An oval-shaped library stamp from the University of British Columbia, partially overlapping the text above. The text "THE LIBRARY" is curved along the top edge, and "UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA" is curved along the bottom edge. In the center, the date "AUG 19 1959" is stamped.

AUG 19 1959

35 cents

The American Quarterly

on the

SOVIET UNION

VOL. I

APRIL, 1938

No. 1

Table of Contents

	PAGE
Housecleaning in Soviet Law, <i>by John N. Hazard</i>	5
Style Developments in Soviet Architecture, <i>by Talbot Faulkner Hamlin</i>	17
The Oil Industry of the USSR, <i>by Samuel S. Shipman</i>	22
Study of a Ukrainian Collective Farm, <i>by Joseph B. Phillips</i>	32
The Man of Eighteen Symphonies, <i>by Nicolas Slonimsky</i>	41
List of Miaskovsky's Principal Works, <i>by Nicolas Slonimsky</i> ...	45

DOCUMENTS

Decree Stopping Payments to Italian Firms	49
Decision Cancelling January "Stakhanovite Month"	49
Amendments to the Constitution	50
Statistics of Delegates to the Supreme Council	51
Principal Appointments	52
New Theatrical Productions, Operas and Ballets, and Music	54

NEWS CHRONOLOGY—

December 1937, January and February 1938

INTERNAL AFFAIRS	56
Agriculture; Arctic; Art and Music; Aviation; Campaign against Wrecking and Espionage; Defense; Government; Industry; Theatre and Cinema; Miscellaneous.	
FOREIGN AFFAIRS	65
Border States in Europe; Consulates; Far Eastern Affairs; Foreign Trade; Italy; United States; Miscellaneous.	

Editor—HARRIET MOORE

The BULLETIN ON THE SOVIET UNION, published semi-monthly by the Institute, is a necessary supplement to THE QUARTERLY in providing information and background material on current developments in the USSR. For this reason the two publications are sold together at a joint subscription price of \$2.00 per year.

1

The responsibility for the opinions expressed in the articles published in THE QUARTERLY ON THE SOVIET UNION and for the accuracy of the statements contained in them rests solely with the individual authors. The Editor is responsible for the selection of the authors and the acceptance of articles.

Published by
THE AMERICAN RUSSIAN INSTITUTE, INC.
56 WEST 45TH STREET
NEW YORK CITY

COMPOSED, PRINTED AND BOUND BY UNION LABOR
AT THE ACADEMY PRESS, NEW YORK, N. Y.
MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

To the Readers:

The American Russian Institute is undertaking the publication of THE AMERICAN QUARTERLY ON THE SOVIET UNION with the aim of furnishing a periodical in which authoritative information on the Soviet Union will appear. The specialized articles which it will contain are intended to give careful analyses in various fields of study concerning the USSR. In this way it is hoped that serious students of the Soviet Union may regularly make available the result of their studies on the many aspects of Soviet development. In turn, it is hoped that THE QUARTERLY may be of use to students of the Soviet Union by providing, in addition to specialized articles, considerable reference material, such as translations of important documents, statistical and biographical material, and a news chronology.

Since this publication is issued to serve those interested in obtaining information on the USSR, both laymen and specialists, the Institute hopes to have the full cooperation of these groups. In particular, the Institute asks for criticism of the first issue of THE QUARTERLY and for suggestions as to additional types of material which would be of use for publication in subsequent issues.

THE EDITORIAL BOARD

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE ARE:

JOHN N. HAZARD, recently returned from three years of study at the Moscow Juridical Institute under a grant from the Institute of Current World Affairs. He is now preparing to take a J.S.D. Degree at the University of Chicago.

TALBOT FAULKNER HAMLIN, Librarian of the Avery Architectural Library, Columbia University.

JOSEPH B. PHILLIPS, formerly Moscow correspondent of the *New York Herald Tribune* from August, 1935 to April, 1937. He is now foreign editor of *Newsweek*.

SAMUEL S. SHIPMAN, formerly editor of the *Economic Review of the Soviet Union* and in charge of the Information Department of Amtorg. He is now engaged in business research.

NICOLAS SLONIMSKY, composer and author of *Music Since 1900*.

HOUSECLEANING IN SOVIET LAW

By

JOHN N. HAZARD

PAGING through any American newspaper uncovers accounts of the Soviet housecleaning. Dissenters and highly placed counter-revolutionaries have been discovered in every field, and law is no exception. The year 1937 will go down in legal annals as the most tempestuous of all the past twenty years of development, the year in which basic principles of law underwent a thoroughgoing revision.

Americans, accustomed as they are to practical problems, have been inclined to ignore the theoretical bases on which these problems rest. That attitude of mind has contributed to the difficulty in understanding what has been transpiring in Soviet halls of legal learning. Only the fireworks have been described on the American side of the water, and many an American reader has shuddered in reading of the ousting of former jurists without comprehending the danger they represented to the continued existence of the Soviet Union as it is known today.

The fireworks have been somewhat spectacular, for the past year has been the occasion for the repudiation of a legal theoretician who had gained no little reputation. E. B. Pashukanis had stood practically at the head of the profession. His position as the Director of the Institute of Soviet Construction and Law of the Academy of Sciences had given him a place of leadership in theoretical circles of Moscow and of the whole Union. His editorship of the magazine *Sovetskoe Gosudarstvo* had provided him with a tribune from which he had caught the attention of the world, for this journal had been long accepted by world scholars as the mouthpiece of the legal fraternity in the Soviet Union.

Pashukanis' influence on legal developments went beyond the theoretical sphere, for his Institute had drafted many a new law. He had even been appointed in November, 1936, as Vice Commissar of Justice delegated to the drafting of the new All-Union codes of law provided for in the new constitution. No Soviet law student ever questioned his authority, and a quota-

tion from any of his books or articles was the most potent of arguments in any debate.

Disciples of the master were numerous, spreading out into the various Juridical Institutes and centers of legal education. Men like Dotsenko, Berman, Cheliapov, and Ginzburg were doing the lecturing and writing the law books. Today they and their teacher are in disgrace, their books have been withdrawn from libraries and bookstalls, and their doctrines have been branded as the teaching of enemies of the people. Their repudiation has been complete, and their ideas are the butt of criticism in every law lecture and in every issue of the magazines formerly edited by them.

I.

According to Soviet jurists this housecleaning turns on the interpretation of Marxian theories of the state and law. Legal theory is rarely a subject which can be made entertaining, and the close reasoning which has characterized the recent purge in Moscow legal circles presents peculiar difficulties. It is only fair to warn those who dislike the mental gymnastics of the Soviet theoretical discussion to stop at the very threshold of the problem. They should also be warned that no effort is being made here to evaluate the Soviet argument, for exposition alone presents problems enough.

Origin of Law

Pashukanis' whole misunderstanding sprang from his interpretation of the origin of law. He saw law arising in exchange, in the market place of the primeval tribes, whose division of labor had forged the new concept of private property.¹ He watched law progress through the centuries until it flowered into its most complete and exalted form under the bourgeoisie, the super-traders who made exchange and trade their chief occupation. He drew the conclusion that law was a product of the free market place, and, since it reached its most developed form under the bourgeoisie, he explained that law was essentially a bourgeois product; it could be thought of as bourgeois law.

1. See E. Pashukanis, *Obshchaia Teoriia Gosudarstva i Prava*. [The General Theory of the State and Law]. Moscow, 1929

Orthodox Marxists will immediately see how this theory was at variance with the explanation of the Marxian classics. Engels had clearly outlined the rise of law in connection with the rise of the first state.² He explained that law was only a creature of the state, a norm not above class, but a tool in the hands of the ruling class of each epoch, and he dug back into earliest history to prove his point that law had first appeared when the tribal chieftains seized power unto themselves, destroyed the old tribal gentile constitutions and built up an apparatus of compulsion by means of which they solidified their position.

Quite clearly to Engels the state had been created only after the appearance of the concept of private property, a concept which made possible the centering of economic power in an individual or group of individuals. Also equally clearly, the concept of private property had arisen as a result of the development of exchange between tribes, some of whom had pushed the new, more productive principles of the division of labor so far that they produced only cattle and needed to trade to acquire the other necessities of life. After examining this historical development, Engels drew the conclusion that the state arose on the heels of exchange, and law followed later as the creation of the state and not of the market place. The chronological sequence: exchange—state—law is basic to the Marxian interpretation.

Pashukanis' interpretation had missed the importance of this order, and in linking law directly to the market place and exchange instead of to the state he made his great mistake. Critics argued that if law were really directly a product of the free market place and had always served those interests, any destruction of the free market place would of necessity bring the elimination of law.³ It will be seen later what ramifications Pashukanis' conclusion had in practice.

Faced with this patent error, Pashukanis recanted and withdrew from his interpretation of origin of law, publishing a little pamphlet in 1930⁴ to bring himself into line with ortho-

2. See Frederick Engels, *Origin of the Family, the State, and Private Property*, Chas. Kerr, Chicago, 1902, and V. I. Lenin, *The State and Revolution*, Eng. ed., Moscow, 1935; or The Vanguard Press, New York, 1929.

3. See P. Yudin, "Protiv Putanitsy, Poshlosti i Revizionizma," [Against Confusion, Platitudes, and Revisionism], *Pravda*, No. 20 (6986), January 20, 1937, p. 4.

4. E. Pashukanis, *Za Marksio-Leninskuiu Teoriju Gosudarstva i Prava* [For a Marxist-Leninist Theory of the State and Law], Moscow, 1931.

dox writers. He accepted the principle that law is a product of the state, and, that as the state is reshaped to the use of a new class, the law is also changed, as has happened in the three great epochs of the history of society. It was created to serve slaveholders, feudal lords, and bourgeoisie in that order. He accepted the principle that in each of these epochs the law was different in character, and that his early interpretation of law as a bourgeois tool amounted to the failure to see anything but the bourgeois epoch.

Errors in Philosophy

Although publicly withdrawing his theory as to the origin of law, Pashukanis held fast to other conceptions which are now being traced to his original error. Critics today doubt whether he ever really discarded his basic erroneous concept, for they see it as underlying his maneuvers of the early 1930's.⁵

Forced to accept the argument that a new character had been given to law by the proletarian revolution, Pashukanis was pushed into saying that a law—socialist in substance—had been created. He could not deny that nationalization of land and socialization of the means of production had marked very real departures from the principles underlying the law of the preceding epochs. He had to admit that law had become socialist in substance, but at the same time he was troubled by the fact that he and his colleagues had copied almost word for word many articles of the French, Swiss and German civil codes in writing the Soviet codes.

Arguing before the same people who had proved to him his error in failing to see that Soviet law had no relation to the market place and was not bourgeois in substance, he claimed that the Soviet law which he had helped to write was at least bourgeois in form even though entirely socialist in substance. The legal theoreticians looked at the similarity of words in the Soviet civil codes and the bourgeois civil codes and admitted that there was indeed a similarity in form. The discovery worried some of these men, and they were responsible

5. The author's own article on Soviet law fitted in between the first recantation of Pashukanis and his eventual complete repudiation. In consequence it reflects corrections as to the origin of law, but it also reflects the basic errors as to the relationship of form and substance. It should be read in the light of the corrections now being made. See Hazard, "Soviet Law: An Introduction," *Columbia Law Review*, Vol. XXXVI, No. 8, December, 1936. pp. 1236-1266.

for an insertion in the civil code of an annotation to the effect that inasmuch as the civil code was drawn from bourgeois codes it should be narrowly applied.⁶ They hoped in this way to separate the bourgeois form from the socialist substance and make sure that application of the code would conform closely to principles of socialism.

Pashukanis is now criticized because this separation of form and substance amounts to a failure to understand Hegelian philosophy.⁷ The error is laid to the poor teaching of philosophy in the Union, and writers urge a renewed educational campaign in principles of philosophy.⁸ Writers say that if Pashukanis had known his philosophy, he would never have argued that Soviet law was bourgeois in form, for he would have realized that similarity in terminology has nothing to do with similarity in form. He would also have perceived the errors in his arguments if he had known philosophy, for he would have known that true form and substance are inseparable. To have argued as he did that Soviet law was bourgeois in form would have meant that it could hardly have been also socialist in substance, since such a split cannot exist. In connection with the past year's purge, the annotation with respect to the bourgeois form of the civil code has been removed⁹ as unnecessary now that it is recognized that the code is both socialist in form and substance, and that only the terminology, which is an unimportant element, is similar in some places to the terminology of bourgeois codes.

Critics pointed out that the very fact that the Soviet code had been promulgated by Soviets and contained principles of socialism in the socialization of the means of production as opposed to the universal bourgeois principle of private property in the means of production was sufficient evidence that Pashukanis had been wrong. They explained that the code must be looked at as a whole, and if that is done, they thought that its socialist form would then be apparent, for the articles having bourgeois terminology would be clearly but patches

6. See annotation to Art. 403 of the Civil Code of the RSFSR (1936 edition), p. 130.

7. See P. Yudin, "Sotsializm i Pravo" [Socialism and Law], *Bolshevik*, No. 17, September 1, 1937, p. 31 at p. 40.

8. See M. Mitin and P. Yudin, "O Filisofskom Obrazovanii v S.S.S.R." [Philosophical Education in the U.S.S.R.], *Pravda*, No. 55, (7021), February 25, 1937, pp. 2-3.

9. See annotation to Art. 403 of the Civil Code of the RSFSR (1937 edition) p. 168.

on a whole which was essentially different from anything known to the past.¹⁰

Critics now say that there was cause for worry in Pashukanis' separation of form and substance. They even now say that he made this separation on purpose so that he might use the bourgeois form of law, for which he fought, in rolling back the socialist state surreptitiously towards bourgeois principles.¹¹ They now say that he was hoping by the introduction of bourgeois forms to push the state back to the position from which the revolution had advanced, and for that reason they call him a counter-revolutionary and class enemy.

Whether Pashukanis really intended to make this transition or merely erred in his interpretation so that it looks as if he had been working for this transition will not be known until the records of the investigators have been brought to light. In any case, this intent is being ascribed to his actions and accounts for the extensiveness of his repudiation.

The Withering Away of the State

Errors as to origin of law and in philosophical distinctions were left for discussion in halls of learning or ignored entirely until the development of the socialist state became impeded by the more important theories which sprang from them. Pashukanis was attacked only in the legal journals until his conclusions as to the withering away of the state struck at the very heart of the Soviet state. It is here that he over-reached himself, and to the foreigner it seems that if this aspect had not appeared he might never have gone the way of an enemy.

The Soviet jurist points out that his great error was the logical result of the misinterpretations and misunderstandings which have just been outlined. For that reason these somewhat complicated theoretical errors have been analyzed even at the expense of appearing meticulous and unnecessarily obscure.

10. "The form of Soviet law, as differing from bourgeois law in principle, is reflected not in terminology, but in its political direction, in the fact that this law was promulgated by Soviets as the organs of the dictatorship of the proletariat; it is Soviet law, i.e., socialist in substance. In some articles of Soviet legislation, and in some laws in their entirety terms of bourgeois legislation are met with. But that is immaterial. Essential is the fact that the Soviet character or Soviet form of law is reflected, as has been said, in its political direction, in the socialist substance. Both the form and substance of Soviet law are one; only as law promulgated by the Soviet authority can it be proletarian and socialist." See P. Yudin, *op. cit. supra*, note 7 at p. 41.

11. See M. Rapoport, "Protiv Vrazhdebnykh Teorii Mezhdunarodnogo Prava" [Against Hostile Theories of International Law], *Sovetskoe Gosudarstvo*, No. 1-2, 1937. p. 92 at p. 97.

Americans who have become familiar with similar repudiations in history will perhaps recognize a parallel between this linking of changes in theory with changes in practice and similar linkings which have not been unknown in our own America.

Pashukanis took the doctrine of the "withering away of the state," long known to Marxist writers, and interpreted it in the light of his own understanding of the origin and nature of law. Marx and Engels had talked of the withering away as a sure consequence of the creation of a classless society.¹² This conclusion followed from their analysis of the state as a creature of the strongest economic class, who in each epoch created it and used it to preserve the power of that class. With such a premise it followed that when a classless society should at last come into being, there would no longer be need of an apparatus whose only purpose in history had been exploitation and the exercise of compulsion. Society would have advanced to the stage where no one would need suppression, since there would be no dominant class deriving profits because of economic position and ownership of the means of production. It was to be a stage when exploitation as defined in these terms could no longer be possible, and in consequence the state apparatus as an organ of compulsion would no longer be of any use. The situation would parallel that of the flower, deprived of its nourishment—in this case the need to protect an exploiting class—and the result would be a withering away.

As to when and how this process of withering would come about, Marx and Engels were nearly silent. Both recognized that it could not occur in a few short years. Both recognized that there would be some intervening period during which the transition would be carried out by a dictatorship of the proletariat, since they realized that such tremendous changes cannot be brought about quickly. Society does not move that way.

Pashukanis taught that the withering away began on November 7, 1917, when the proletarian revolution became successful, and he believed that this withering away would continue until every last vestige of the state apparatus had disappeared from view as no longer necessary. He saw the withering

12. See Karl Marx, *Critique of the Gotha Program*. Eng. ed., Moscow, 1937. pp. 27-28, and Engels, *op. cit. supra*, note 2.

away as being a shrivelling of each leaf, one by one over a period of years, rather than a sudden withering of the whole flower when the nourishment reached its end.

Pashukanis was even bold enough to state that the withering would reach a decisive stage at the end of the second five year plan, 1937, when socialism was to be achieved according to the program. As he interpreted it, classes would then have disappeared in the economic sense, and he drew the conclusion that the state would also have withered away. He did not figure on other elements—the encirclement of the Soviet Union by capitalist countries providing a daily threat to the existence of the state and providing hostile elements from without and support to hostile elements within. He also did not figure on the fact that there would still be a difference between agricultural work and industrial work, even though exploitation of class by class had been eliminated. Finally he failed to foresee that private property in consumption goods was still to play a major role.

Historical events showed how wrong Pashukanis was. The new constitution was enacted in 1936,¹³ and it was announced in its very first article that socialism had been achieved. The mere fact that other articles followed to define the structure of the state and law set at rest any doubts as to whether the state and law had withered away. Stalin had said in the XVIth Party Congress that no withering away could yet occur, and he explained that any dialectical thinker must understand that to eventually wither away, the state must first grow stronger.¹⁴ Absence of state could follow only from presence of state in a form stronger than ever known before.

Everything pointed to the danger of Pashukanis' interpretation of the doctrine of the withering away of the state, and his earlier teachings were combed to find the philosophical and analytical bases which might account for that error.

II.

Should an American raise his eyebrows over this tempest over theories the Soviet jurist will point out practical effects following the application of these theories to the development of Soviet law.

13. For English translation of text, see Rappard, Sharp, Schneider, Pollock and Harper, *Source Book on European Governments*. Van Nostrand, New York, 1937. p. v-108.

14. See J. Stalin, *Leninism*, Eng. ed., Moscow, 1934. Vol. II, p. 342.

Civil Law

Believing that the state was slowly withering away as socialism came nearer to achievement, Pashukanis advocated the cessation of courses in civil law. He understood civil law to be the regulation of the relations of men under the trading conditions of capitalism, and, as such, no longer of importance, as the remnants of capitalism disappeared.

His influence was so marked that the courses in civil law in the law school were abolished, and to replace them there appeared a course called economic-administrative law, concerning itself with regulation of the relations between state enterprises. Individuals as subjects of the law became of secondary importance in the face of the administration of the huge machinery necessary in a socialist state. Pashukanis thought he saw something approaching the "administration of things" of which Engels had written,¹⁵ when individuals would no longer need policing due to their very high state of development and understanding in an economic situation which removed all want and poverty and replaced it by a society where disputes engendered by lack of the goods and pleasures of this world could not arise.

Law concerning the rights of individuals was relegated to a few hours at the end of the course in economic-administration law and given apologetically, as an unwelcome necessity for a few years due to the fact that capitalist relationships and bourgeois psychology had not yet been wholly eliminated.

This point of view was reflected in the books of the period which appeared under the title of *Economic-Administrative Law*,¹⁶ and covered aspects of civil law in a few chapters at the back. The result of this policy was that graduates of law schools and practicing attorneys and judges knew very little about the law concerning the rights of individuals. They were experts when it came to settling disputes between two state enterprises, but they hardly knew about such rights of a citizen as those against a tortfeasor or the rights of a relative against a decedent's estate.

15. See Frederick Engels, *Herr Eugen Duhring's Revolution in Science* [Anti-Duhring]. Eng. ed., Moscow, 1934. p. 315.

16. See *Kurs Sovetskogo Khoziaistvennogo Prava*, pod red. L. Ginzburga i E. Pashukanisa. Moskva, 1935. Also B. M. Rubinshtein, *Sovetskoe Khoziaistvennoe Pravo*. Moskva, 1935.

The Stakhanov movement swept into being when law was centering all attention on state enterprises and ignoring the individual. Property of a new type, the result of earnings and not of trade became a pressing reality. The people who were acquiring it proved to be the ones on whom the government looked most hopefully to raise the level of production to the point needed for the achievement of socialism and eventual communism. These men and women were the heroes of the country, and the success of the movement demanded that they and their property relations be fully protected by the law and lawyers. The result was an attack upon the theories which had been propounded by Pashukanis and his disciples.

The draft constitution which appeared in June, 1936, emphasized the rights of individuals. With its adoption in December there was no question as to the importance of these rights. Article 7 guaranteed to the collective farmer his little plot of land attached to the house and a certain limited amount of personal property. Article 10 guaranteed to citizens the right of personal property in their income from work and their savings, in their dwelling houses and auxiliary household economy, their domestic furniture and utensils and objects of personal use and comfort, as well as the right of inheritance of personal property.

The change in legal circles was extensive. The course in economic-administrative law was removed from the curriculum of the Law Schools. In its place was introduced a course in civil law, beginning with the analysis of the rights of individuals. The relations between state enterprises were treated in other courses on Administrative Law, on Credit Law, Transport Law, and wherever they fitted in. Emphasis was on the individual. Books were republished entitled *Economic-Administrative and Civil Law*,¹⁷ and editors explained that the former error had been the result of the great influence Pashukanis had exerted on legal thought.

Criminal Law

Pashukanis' confusion over the difference between terminology and form, and on the withering away of the state was

17. See B. M. Rubenshtein, *Sovetskoe Khoziaistvennoe i Grazhdanskoe Pravo*. Moskva, 1936.

reflected in the drafts for a new criminal code.¹⁸ Appearing annually from 1930 to 1935, these drafts even though not adopted exerted a large influence upon the teaching of criminal law and on the application of the old code which courts believed destined soon to be replaced.

These drafts sought to eliminate what Pashukanis believed to be vestiges of bourgeois law. He argued that a step should be taken immediately to remove these vestiges so that there might be evidence of the withering away of the state and law.

His attacks on what he called vestiges of bourgeois law centered on two aspects of the Soviet criminal codes—the “dosage system” and the differentiation between crimes committed intentionally, negligently, and without fault at all.

The “dosage system” was the defining of a fixed penalty for each type of crime. To be sure the code allowed slight leeway in the form of maximum and minimum limits to a penalty, but in essence the penalty was fixed for each crime. Pashukanis traced the rise of this system from the “eye for an eye” or vengeance principle which had been characteristic of the earliest criminal law. He argued that the principle could have nothing to do with socialism where vengeance should be replaced by defense of proletarian society as the basic motive underlying criminal law. Under his approach the fixed penalty system had nothing to do with socialism, because it had grown up outside of socialism, and so he demanded that there be a radical change to show that the law was beginning to wither away.

Critics now teach that Pashukanis’ errors in theory had confused him. Because the “dosage system” had been used by the bourgeoisie he thought the principle bourgeois in nature. He failed to see that only the terminology had been carried over. He failed to understand that this terminology had become imbued with a new socialist substance or purpose, and that this had caused it to change its form as well, so that it had nothing in common with the bourgeoisie except its terminology. Jurists argued that the principle was essential to Soviet law, for if it were abandoned each court would give differing sentences for the same crime, and the resulting chaos in the administration of justice would undermine the public’s confidence in Soviet law.

18. See N. V. Krylenko, *Proekt Ugolovnogo Kodeksa Soyuz S.S.R., 1 Problemy Ugolovnoi Politiki*, Moskva, 1935, p. 3. [The Draft Criminal Code of the U.S.S.R.]

Critics point to the theoretical errors, and say that they caused the practical blunder of great potential danger to the state.

A second error was in trying to eliminate the distinction between crimes committed intentionally, negligently and without fault at all on the theory that this was also a bourgeois distinction. The result of this teaching was that courts made some terrible blunders in sentencing innocent people who had killed without any negligence at all on their part.

III.

Pashukanis' erroneous theories affected many another field of law. Labor law,¹⁹ agrarian law, and international law²⁰ are now being cleared of his influence. Each will now be restudied, and new books will appear. Critics have called for the publication of new texts on all aspects of Soviet law,²¹ and legal circles are now engaged in this monumental task.

Basic lines of theory are now clear once again after some months of confusion, and the stage is set for new expositions. Errors will be made in the future just as they have been in the past, but Soviet law will continue to march on, attached as it is to a mighty developing state.

19. See Leontev, "Ob Odnoi Vrednoi Teorii" [One Dangerous Theory], *Pravda*, No. 57 (7023), February 27, 1937. p. 4.

20. *Op. cit. supra*, note 11.

21. See P. Yudin, *op. cit. supra*, note 7 at p. 46.

STYLE DEVELOPMENTS IN SOVIET ARCHITECTURE

By

TALBOT FAULKNER HAMLIN

IN THE enthusiasm which followed the final success of the Russian Revolution and the establishment of the Soviet State, architectural thought found its expression in an immediate and complete break with the entire past. The Soviet world was a new world and Soviet architecture should accordingly be a new architecture. The natural result was a frenzied search for new types of architecture to express this feeling.

Out of this first experimental period three basic theories were developed, supported by three differing groups of architects. The first group called themselves "*constructivists*." It aimed to found a new architecture upon a new aesthetic theory, the theory that all beauty for a new age must be developed out of the expression of energy (that is, dynamism) or else out of forms which relate to machines, as the great channels through which energy acts. The result of the work of this school was a series of brilliant and revolutionary designs, extraordinarily imaginative and varied, but few actual buildings. In fact, few of these brilliant designs were buildable at all, given the facilities which the country could command. Tatlin's great spiral design for a Soviet monument is famous; even more expressive of the constructivist trend are the exciting illustrations to the books which Chernikov published. Chernikov's drawings are most valuable as stimulants to the imagination, and drawing after drawing is poetic to the last degree. Yet, even when these drawings have some distant relation to building forms, they are not, and never were meant to be, designs for buildings themselves. They are interesting and fantastic patterns on paper, but only the most thoughtless would ever attempt to translate them into three-dimensional structure.

The second great group called themselves the "*formalists*." With an aesthetic purpose not unlike that of the earlier Erich Mendelsohn—that is, basically expressionistic—the formalists set themselves the task of producing building designs in which

the most salient purposes were expressed or symbolized in the plan. Although the designs from this school have a greater reality than those of the "constructivists," they are still far from founded on the realities of actual construction. An architectural plan is merely a symbol; no one ever sees the plan of an actual building, although the plan directs his every move in and about the building. Thus the famous Workers' Club in Moscow, by Melnikov, has a plan like a cogwheel, but no one seeing the building can realize the cogwheel basis of the design unless carefully directed to do so. Again, as in the case of the "constructivists," the approach to architecture has been purely aesthetic and symbolic rather than realistic.

The third group aimed at developing a Soviet architecture along the lines of the strictest functionalism, looking for inspiration to the work of LeCorbusier and the Dessau Bauhaus. It attempted to find the most logical answers to the pressing building problems and to express the results in the most stripped and stark manner. Here again, despite certain success in some apartment house and sanatorium work, the general tendency of this school was to produce buildings which were too definitely doctrinaire. In the pursuit of functionalism they tended to forget that man is an intellectual and an aesthetic, as well as a physiological, entity.

Another factor which made it extremely difficult for any of these styles to develop into an actual living architecture was the Soviet Union's poverty, during the 1920's, in accurately fabricated modern building materials. Almost the entire building industry of the USSR was still geared to the old, traditional methods of construction, and the difficulties of obtaining such things as metal window frames were almost insurmountable. As a result, again and again even the best of the functional work was, in actuality, crudely built, difficult to maintain, and crudely experimental in effect.

To assist in developing a new building technique, many foreign experts were called in. But, working in a country and under conditions which were strange to them, their influence was limited. Even when the actual construction—like LeCorbusier's great building for light industries in Moscow—was in itself a creative and beautiful work, it was achieved only

with the greatest effort and by constant struggle. Manifestly such work could never be widely produced in the country.

This general confusion of trends, none of which had been able to establish a practical working basis for Soviet architecture, was brought to a climax by the competition for the Palace of the Soviets in Moscow. Competitors from all over the western world, as well as from the Soviet Union itself, submitted drawings. In them could be seen almost all the styles of the present and the past, classic, expressionist, or functional. The exhibition of these drawings was seen by hundreds of thousands of people, and, in accordance with the Soviet desire to build a people's culture, much weight was given to the general popular reaction to the different types of drawings submitted.

It is not necessary to go into the subsequent history of this project in detail—the award of first prizes to three designs; one along the lines of American vertical skyscraper architecture, by Hamilton; one of lavish classic derivation, by Shchuko; and one which, in a sense, was between the two, by Iofan—and then the final commission award to Iofan. What *is* important is the official report made by the commissioners in charge, because it stated so clearly the ideals which the authorities felt should control the future architecture of the Soviets. In the first place, it should be a people's architecture and, as such, basically humane, rich with details which should appeal to the people. It should have much sculpture and painting. It should not be an architecture mechanistic in spirit, as a mechanistic art was *per se* contrary to a people's art; especially it must avoid the evils of the strict functionalism shown in such designs as that of LeCorbusier. In the next place, the report stated, quoting Lenin, that, since the socialist revolutionary state became the heir of the state which it succeeded, so a socialist and revolutionary culture should not cut itself off entirely from the culture that had preceded, but rather absorb it and put it to new use. Thus, it would be unnecessary to abandon all the architectures of the past, as the earlier revolutionary architects had tried to do. The aim should rather be to gain, for the new, all of the benefits which the old had developed.

This point of view was developed further and more explicitly by the architect and critic Tolstoi, in a widely publicized article

on the future of Soviet architecture. Accepting the theory that Soviet culture was the heir of the past, Tolstoi attempts an examination of past architectures in an effort to find out which of them is susceptible of future development in a socialist state. He rules out all the oriental styles, the Byzantine, and the Romanesque as styles developed primarily on a religious basis and for mystical ends. Gothic is similarly eliminated as being both mystical and characteristic of a world of feudalism. The Renaissance is out because the Renaissance was the age of tyrants. The post-war functional movement is especially obnoxious, because to Tolstoi it signified the slavery of man to the machine and was therefore fundamentally the capitalist architecture *par excellence*. A socialist architecture, on the other hand, should express man as the master of machines, and this functionalism could never do. There remained the classic architecture of Greece and Rome, and in both Tolstoi finds a basis essentially civic and social. Greek architecture was the architecture primarily of the city state, and Roman architecture primarily and in its greatest works—baths, theatres, fora, etc.—an architecture of social usefulness. Both were designed for the delight and the use of the free citizen. As such, Tolstoi concludes, these are the only two architectures fit for socialist development, and he makes a plea for a new renaissance of Greek and Roman forms, based on socialist ideals and needs, as the earlier renaissance had been based on the needs of kings and tyrants.

With such an official and critical backing, the development of a classic type of architecture in Russia was inevitable. There was, however, one other strong element at work, which added to the strength of this new movement; that was the question of popular taste. If it is true that a socialist state builds communally for its inhabitants, the views and tastes of the citizens achieve an importance impossible under other conditions. It has been the definite policy in the Soviet republic to stimulate popular criticism of architectural designs and executed buildings, and to attempt to develop future work on the basis of these criticisms. The wisdom, from an artistic point of view, of such an effort is of course a subject for possible debate, but the fact is there.

Since the period of the great Byzantine churches, Russia up to the time of the Revolution had developed but one style of architecture which had native vitality; that was the classic revival of the end of the 18th and the early 19th centuries. Based originally on the work of foreigners like the Italians, Quarenghi and Rossi, and the Scotch Cameron, it had grown into a truly national expression. Such works as, for instance, the great Admiralty Building at Leningrad, by Sakharov, are magnificent creations unlike the classic buildings anywhere else. Moreover, many smaller houses and villas in the countryside were similarly exquisite in taste and impressive in total effect. One might almost say that these classic revival buildings, plus the beautiful workmanship of traditional log houses, together formed the only valid basis of living Russian architecture prior to the Revolution.

The existence of this pool of admirable classic work could not but develop a strong tradition of popular taste within the people themselves, and this bias in favor of a style having some relation to the earlier classic tradition found enthusiastic expression at an early period. Thus, one of the first of the great classic buildings of Moscow, an apartment house with a six-story order of enormous engaged composite columns, was immediately given the popular name of the "House Beautiful." And so popular desire for classic was added to the official approval of classic, and a flood of interpretations of classic forms naturally followed.

This does not mean that other quieter and perhaps more logical types of design have been entirely abandoned, and it makes very difficult the use of the terms "radical," "progressive," or "conservative," as applied to architecture in Soviet Russia. The theatre at Rostov-on-Don is, for instance, definitely not a classic-type building, and much in its design borrows from formalist and even constructivist ideals. Yet it, too, is much admired today, as are also many of the freer works of such advanced architects as the Vesnin brothers. The present movement, however, seems definitely along the other lines, and it will be interesting to see what simplifications and modifications of the classic tradition may be produced in the future, as architects grow more poised, more simple, and less archeological in their handling of it.

THE OIL INDUSTRY OF THE USSR

By

SAMUEL S. SHIPMAN

THE oil riches of Russia have long been a matter of interest to the world at large. Possession of the most abundant petroleum resources of any country in the world and its rank next to the United States as a producer of this valuable and strategic mineral have been important elements in the development of the USSR as a major factor in world economy. Formerly the Soviet Union played a more considerable role as an exporter of oil than at present. In the past few years, however, the rapidly increasing needs of Soviet industry and transportation have made it necessary to retain a larger proportion of the output for domestic consumption. As a result, while production has risen, exports have declined.

The Soviet Union now accounts for about 10 per cent of world production; the United States supplies 63 per cent of the total. In view of its tremendous resources and its steadily rising level of industrial technique, it seems likely that in the not distant future the Soviet Union's share in world production will be considerably greater than at present.

Oil Resources of the USSR

At the Seventeenth International Geological Congress, held in Moscow in July, 1937, the growth of the known petroleum reserves of the USSR was outlined in a comprehensive report presented by I. M. Gubkin, Vice-President of the Academy of Sciences and the Soviet's foremost petroleum geologist. Mr. Gubkin stated that, as a result of the extensive investigations carried out in the past few years, the proven resources have increased several-fold. Many new fields have been brought to light while the oil-bearing areas of the old districts have been greatly extended. The known reserves on January 1, 1937, were estimated at 3,877 million tons. In arriving at this figure there were taken into consideration residuary reserves in those horizons now being worked; resources already surveyed and prepared for the sinking of new wells; deposits disclosed by wells now producing commercial quantities but as yet not completely

surveyed; and reserves, in those seams and horizons of areas under exploitation, assumed on the basis of the geological structure of the field and locality. In addition, there is a category of "possible" reserves, consisting of those resources believed, on the basis of geological considerations, to be contained in structures whose formation is as yet not definitely established. These reserves are estimated at 2½ billion tons.

Using the method of calculation employed in making the estimate of the resources of the USSR, Soviet geologists have set the world total known-reserves at 7,075 million tons, of which the Soviet Union accounts for about 55 per cent, Europe and Asia outside the USSR for 13 per cent, the United States for 25 per cent, the remainder of the western hemisphere for 5 per cent, and Africa and Oceania for 2 per cent. Other estimates place the world's oil resources at between nine and ten billion tons, which would bring the share of the USSR to around 40 per cent. In this connection it is of interest to note that since the inception of regular statistical data on petroleum production about 80 years ago, world output has been approximately four billion tons, indicating that the reserves in the ground are about twice the amount of oil already consumed. However, at the rate of production of 1937—290,000,000 tons—the known resources would last only about 25 or 35 years. Despite this apparently pessimistic statistical outlook, it is the opinion of many geologists that future investigations, particularly by means of new methods developed in recent years, will uncover vast reserves the existence of which is as yet unsuspected.

The problem of possible exhaustion of reserves has received special attention in the United States, in view of the fact that at the present rate of consumption of 1,000,000,000 to 1,200,000,000 barrels annually the known supply would be sufficient for only about a dozen years. Though the situation is thus sufficiently serious in this country to arouse extended discussion, the consensus of belief is that American geological science will be able to cope with it. The USSR is not yet confronted with this problem. Even the present known resources would permit of continuously expanding production for several generations to come. Account must also be taken of the huge supplies of natural gas, now estimated at about one billion

cubic meters. The deposits of oil shale are likewise of considerable potential importance, the proven reserves being appraised at 25,000,000,000 tons.

At the present time about 45 oil fields are under commercial exploitation in the USSR and about 80 fields are being prospected by means of deep drilling. Hundreds of oil-bearing structures are undergoing investigation preparatory to drilling operations. Last year some 370 prospecting parties were in the field, carrying out geophysical, geological, and topographical surveys. Particular emphasis has been placed on the use of geophysical methods and a number of groups are employing the new seismic method involving the study of reperussion waves.

Before the war, hardly any prospecting had been carried on outside of the basic producing regions in Transcaucasia and the North Caucasus. The surveys of the past few years, in addition to enlarging the oil-bearing districts in the old areas, have opened up numerous new fields in other parts of the USSR—the Western Urals, the Lower Volga district, the Kama territory, Central Asia, Sakhalin, and elsewhere.

Particular interest attaches to a number of recent discoveries in the territory lying between the Volga River and the Urals slopes. Oil in commercial quantities has been struck at several localities in the Middle Volga Area and in the Bashkir Republic during the past two years. Together with the oil deposits previously located in the Urals and Bashkiria, they furnish ample evidence of a Soviet "Mid-Continent" oil area of huge extent, and industrial operations are already under way at several fields in this territory. A curious fact in this connection is that wildcat drilling was first started in the Volga area in the '60s of the last century, but the geological knowledge of the district and the drilling methods employed were inadequate to produce tangible results.

In the Far East, aside from the large deposits under exploitation on Sakhalin Island, oil has been uncovered in the past few years in Kamchatka, the Tolba River district in Yakutia, the Ayan-Maisk district in the Far Eastern Territory, the Khatanga district near Lake Baikal, and the Kuznetsk Basin. Drilling operations have been started with a view to determining the

prospects of supplying Eastern Siberia and the Far East with its own liquid fuel. Several localities in the Ukraine and Crimea, formerly considered entirely lacking in oil, are now also considered potential producing areas, though as yet only slightly prospected.

Substantial results have been obtained in the past few years in extracting oil from abandoned and apparently exhausted wells. The method of "rejuvenation" applied involves forcing heated air under pressure into the old well. The oil still contained in the sand and filling the pores of the rock is forced by the current of heated air into other abandoned wells from which it is recovered by pumping. Another new development in the direction of maximum recovery is the method of extracting oil from the bed of the sea, now being successfully worked in the Baku district and in the Izberbash field in Dagestan. The tapping of underwater deposits has been facilitated by the employment of the process of inclined drilling for the first time in the USSR.

Development of the Industry

Before the war, the oil industry in Russia was carried on by hundreds of individual companies, most of them small. Production methods were extremely inefficient and wasteful. Only the richest strata were tapped, the deeper and the relatively poorer horizons being abandoned. The primitive and expensive method of getting up the oil by bailing was the principal means of exploitation. Deep pumping and other modern processes were practically unknown. Drilling was done entirely by the old percussion method. Electrification of the oil fields was still in its infancy and fully a seventh of the oil produced was consumed by the industry itself.

Nevertheless, the tremendous extent of the resources, the numerous gushers struck, and the practice of concentrating operations in the richest horizons made it possible to develop production fairly rapidly. Output of crude oil increased from 3,750,000 metric tons in 1890 to 11,680,000 tons in 1901, the maximum production attained in pre-war Russia. From then on, output declined for a number of years, finally being

stabilized at somewhat over nine million tons annually in the five years preceding the world war.

During the civil war the principal oil fields were seized by the counter-revolutionary forces aided by the British army of intervention. Many of the wells were flooded or set on fire. Equipment was allowed to disintegrate. As a result, at the time the Soviet Government nationalized the industry in 1920, the oil fields and refineries were in a state bordering on ruin. Output had fallen to about 40 per cent of the pre-war level, and there was an extreme shortage of equipment, supplies, and skilled labor.

After the cessation of the civil war and the lifting of the blockade, it became possible to embark on the reconstruction of the industry. The numerous small enterprises were united into a few great state trusts, the two largest, Azneft and Grozneft, operating the fields in Azerbaidzhan and in the Grozny district of the Northern Caucasus. The idle factories and mines of the country began to work and to supply vitally necessary equipment and materials. Contacts with foreign countries were re-established and large quantities of machinery imported.

By 1927, pre-war production had been exceeded and the industry thoroughly overhauled. Rotary and cable drills superseded the percussion drills; pumping, and air and gas lift took the place of bailing; archaic steam engines and boilers were replaced by electric motors; drilling operations were speeded up. The application of deep pumping permitted the complete hermetization of the wells, making possible the recovery of the gases which formerly had gone to waste. The cost of production was reduced to less than half of the former figure.

The capacity of the refining plants was also greatly increased, particularly as regards output of gasoline, kerosene, and motor oils. The growth of production and exports necessitated the building of new pipe lines from the production centers to the refineries and ports. Huge sums were expended every year on the construction of auxiliary structures, such as power plants, railways and roads, housing and community buildings for workers.

The first Five-Year Plan witnessed still more rapid development of the petroleum industry. By 1931, production (includ-

ing gas in the equivalent amount of oil) had mounted to 23,162,000 tons, almost double the 1928 figure, and the industry bore the distinction of being the first of the major industries to complete the quota set for the Five-Year Plan. In the past six years the progress recorded has been considerably slower than in the preceding period. Output in 1936 amounted to 29,300,000 tons, a gain of 26 per cent over the 1931 level.

The failure of the oil industry in the past few years to carry out the program set for it by the Government and to satisfy fully the rapidly increasing requirements of the country has been ascribed primarily to shortcomings in management and technique. In particular, the speed of drilling, though increasing each year, has been far behind American experience. Too long a period has elapsed between the opening up of new deposits and the development of the field to a steady production basis. Not enough attention has been paid to the low-yield wells, with the result that hundreds of wells, still capable of producing, remained idle. These factors have been the subject of exhaustive investigation in the past year or two and a thorough reorganization of the industry has been undertaken in order to eliminate these difficulties. The large increase in drilling since the beginning of 1936 is expected to be reflected in substantially higher production in the near future.

One of the striking features of the development of the industry in recent years has been the growing share of production contributed by the new fields. In 1913, Baku and Grozny accounted for over 96 per cent of the total oil output and the other fields for less than 4 per cent. By 1936, the minor fields had increased their proportion to about 9 per cent, despite the fact that total production had more than trebled. Baku accounted for 76 per cent of the total as against 83 per cent before the war.

The most rapid growth has been shown by the fields in the eastern regions. These increased their contribution from 2.8 per cent of the country's output in 1933 to over 8 per cent in 1936. The principal enterprises are located on the western and southern slopes of the Urals and have been in operation for only three years. The center of this producing area is Ishimbaevo in the Bashkir Republic. Recently a new refinery was

opened there and a pipe line constructed to Ufa, 100 miles away, where a cracking plant was put in operation. A railroad between the two places was completed in 1935. The Central Asian and Sakhalin fields have also increased output considerably. During the period of the third Five-Year Plan it is expected that the relative importance of new fields in total production will continue to increase, although the Baku deposits will yield an expanding output each year.

Refining and Transportation

Refining development has been centered largely on increasing the proportion of light products, particularly gasoline and motor oils. Before the war only 62 per cent of the crude oil produced was run to stills. By 1928, the proportion had been increased to 77 per cent and at the present time it is over 90 per cent. This has necessitated the building of numerous refineries at Baku, Batumi, Tuapse, Saratov, Orsk, and other cities. The yield of the gasoline-naphtha fractions has shown a particularly rapid increase—from 4 per cent of the total production of refined products in 1913 to over 15 per cent at present. The relative share of kerosene has remained almost unchanged, its declining importance for illumination being counterbalanced by increased consumption for tractors and other purposes. In absolute figures, kerosene production is now approximately four times the pre-war figure while the gasoline yield has been increased twenty-fold.

The development of gasoline output by the cracking method has been strikingly rapid. Prior to the first Five-Year Plan, the USSR had no cracking plants, while, by 1936, 58 per cent of all the gasoline was produced by this process. Similarly, pipe stills, first introduced in the Soviet Union a decade ago, now account for about 60 per cent of the total refining capacity. Practically all of the refining equipment now in use has been installed in the past dozen years. Formerly, much of this was imported, mainly from the United States, but in the past few years the domestic machine-industry has developed to the point where it can supply most of the refining equipment required. The same applies to drills, pumps, and other producing machinery.

In recent years, production of many products not previously manufactured in Russia has been inaugurated. These include paraffin, asphalt, petroleum coke, lamp-black, and various types of lubricating oils and greases. Scientific research is conducted on a large scale, particularly with a view to perfecting cracking technique, devising better methods for improving lubricating oils, adoption of the destructive hydrogenation process for treating petroleum, and utilization of residues and wastes by polymerization and other methods. In these advanced fields of petroleum technology the experience of the United States is being closely studied and equipment of the most modern types has been purchased here.

The rapid development of oil extraction and refining was accompanied by the construction of an extensive network of pipe lines to the refining centers and seaports. Before the war the principal method of transporting oil was in small railway tank cars and in river boats. The only large pipe line was that between Baku and Batumi, completed in 1906; altogether only 820 miles of pipe lines were laid in Russia up to 1917. During the period from 1927 to 1937 the Soviet oil industry built lines aggregating almost 3,000 miles. These include a second line between Baku and Batumi (517 miles); the Caspian Sea-Orsk line (440 miles); the Grozny-Tuapse line (385 miles), the Armavir-Trudovaya line (301 miles), and several shorter lines. Some of these projects, particularly the line to Orsk, laid across the deserts of Central Asia, and the Ufa-Ishimbaevo line, where welding was done in temperatures below zero, were carried out under tremendous difficulties. In addition, oil transport by rail and water has been thoroughly overhauled.

The steadily increasing demand for petroleum products on the part of Soviet industry, transport, and agriculture will necessitate a continuing development of the oil industry in the coming years. While the schedule for the third Five-Year Plan, ending in 1942, has not yet been published, preliminary discussions indicate that the aim will be to double the output in the five years. Production in the central and eastern regions is expected to increase four-fold. Special attention is to be devoted to the problem of obtaining natural gas, hitherto relegated to a minor role. Not only will the object be to procure 100 per cent of the gases extracted together with the oil, but special

drilling for gas will be organized for the first time in the USSR at several localities near Baku and in the North Caucasus.

Exports

The considerable increase in the use of automobiles, tractors, and Diesel engines, together with the general industrial development, has resulted in a rapid rise in domestic consumption of oil products and consequently reduced their relative importance in the export trade. Up to 1932, when oil was the leader among the exports of the USSR, shipments abroad increased steadily. In that year exports totaled 6,044,000 tons, over six times the 1913 figure. Since then they have declined to approximately one-third the peak level. It is probable that a factor in this decline is the desire to build up adequate reserves in view of the uncertain international political situation. Whereas both the United States and the Soviet Union ship abroad only from 8 to 12 per cent of their total production, the proportion for the other main producers is around 80 or 90 per cent.

Considering the vital role that oil plays in world politics, it is not surprising that Russian oil has on many occasions been a focus of international interest. During the civil war certain countries banked on obtaining control of this rich prize by extending assistance to the counter-revolutionary armies. After restoration of peace and the lifting of the blockade, the Soviet Union's efforts to regain its old markets were initially hampered by attempts to boycott Russian oil. This abortive campaign was led by Sir Henri Deterding, then head of the Royal Dutch Shell group. A particular target in this skirmish were the contracts concluded in 1927, and later extended, with the Standard Oil of New York and the Vacuum companies, providing for the sale of large quantities of Russian oil in the Near Eastern markets of the American companies. Later, agreements were made with other leading oil companies, and an extensive distributing apparatus was set up in the principal European countries. Several series of negotiations regarding the acquisition of concession rights in Russian oil production and exports by foreign companies failed to materialize, aside from the concession on the Island of Sakhalin granted to Japanese interests.

In 1932 and 1933, France and Italy were the principal importers of Soviet oil, the former employing considerable quantities for naval purposes. The question of oil exports to Italy came dramatically to the forefront in connection with the discussions in the League of Nations regarding the desirability of an international oil embargo on petroleum shipments to Italy during the Ethiopian campaign. The Soviet Union favored such a course but received no support from the other leading nations. It therefore took the position that the interests of collective security would not be served by unilateral action on its part, especially since this would have no effect on the total flow of oil to Italy.

In the past two years Great Britain has been the most important market. Last year its purchases were considerably greater than in 1936. Germany and Spain have also been large importers of Russian oil in recent years. In the absence of international complications it may be expected that the almost inexhaustible oil resources of the Soviet Union will continue to be a major source of supply for world markets.

STUDY OF A UKRAINIAN COLLECTIVE FARM

By

JOSEPH B. PHILLIPS

AS THE most important grain-growing region in the Soviet Union, the Ukraine has been the main proving-ground for the experiment in agricultural collectivization. Especially in the past four or five years the organization of collectives in that Republic has progressed far enough to give a reasonably clear indication of the changes which are to be expected both in agricultural technique and in the cultural aspects of rural life.

Dependence on grain welds the entire Ukraine into a single economic unit in a general sense. At the same time, certain differences in soil from north to south permit variety in secondary crops, from orchards in the north to cotton on the shores of the Black Sea, and these changes affect the character of collectives in different regions. Moreover, collectivization is in such a transitory state at present that single farms reflect to a probably disproportionate extent the energy and intelligence, or the lack of energy and intelligence, of the leaders in each community. Consequently, it would be impossible to select any single collective of the 27,000 in the region as a "typical" collective farm.

The farm described in this article was selected from fifteen visited during a tour of the Ukraine in late July and early August — the harvest season — in 1936. Community life as organized on this farm was chosen as an example because it presents most of the features common to collectives in every part of the Ukraine, having at the same time enough variations to show the divergencies and enough weaknesses in organization to show that the achievements of the experiment still were relatively modest.

The moment at which this study was made may have a certain significance in the history of collectivization. There had been a prolonged drought, beginning in early May. Weather conditions were of a kind which almost inevitably meant a serious failure of the grain crop. While the harvest of that year did not bring in a bumper crop, it was far from a failure. Correct use of machinery and an intelligent utilization of the sys-

tem of collectivized work had produced, for the first time in the history of Soviet agriculture on any large scale, a successful crop in spite of unfavorable weather conditions.

The most fundamental question that can be asked about collectivization, from the technical point of view, is whether it will save Russia from recurrent famines. It would be an exaggeration to say that the experience of 1936 in the Ukraine contributed much to the answer. Its significance was more limited.

More than ninety per cent of the land in the Ukraine is collectivized, and considerably more than ninety per cent of the peasants remaining since the expropriation of kulaks and the famine of 1931-32 are members of collectives. The figures, however, represent a success which was largely political. A great many peasants who had found it expedient to join collectives still were suspicious of the new technique and skeptical of real benefits to themselves. When a good crop was produced under conditions which formerly would have meant failure, the psychological effect on the doubtful element was considerable.

One immediate effect was to improve the quality of work of individuals as soon as success became probable, meaning in this instance that the loss of grain from careless handling at harvest was reduced. Another was to persuade the government that collectivization had reached a point where it was safe to break up numerous state farms and ORS* grain farms and turn the land over to collectives.

Study of any phase of life in the Soviet Union, especially by one with a limited command of the language, is influenced, more than in other countries, by the conditions under which it is made. This tour of collectives in the Ukraine was made by steamboat down the Dnieper River and along the Black Sea coast. I was accompanied by a Russian who had acted as interpreter for the party of Americans who introduced the first combine-harvesters to the Ukraine in 1928, and who was a native of Odessa and familiar with the agricultural problems of the region. After finding that the local agents of the Commissariat of Agriculture in each *raion*, corresponding roughly to county agricultural agents in this country, were capable men usually more interested in agriculture than politics, we used

*Department of Workers' Supply.

them as our main source of general information. At least three farms were visited at each stopping place, and in most cases a full day was devoted to each farm. A good deal of enlightening information was gathered in conversations on steamboats. That part of the journey was like pages out of Mark Twain. The farm described below was one of the most successful in its district and probably above the average of those visited, although less prosperous than those along the Black Sea which have been assisted by the government subsidy for cotton.

The Red Star Collective Farm

The Red Star kolkhoz is one of three collectives in the village of Dimitrov, about fifteen miles from the town of Poltava. Villages in the Ukraine are larger than those in other parts of Russia, and the total population of Dimitrov is about 5,500. Most of the village consists of one-story whitewashed houses of plaster made from mud and cow-dung, but there also is a large manor house, now used as the village soviet, a frame school, a village bath-house, and two new stores, one in a log building for groceries and foodstuffs and the other in a new brick building for the sale of manufactured goods.

The membership of the Red Star collective consists of 370 households of 1,470 individuals. Of this number, however, fifty-one were registered as members although they actually worked at factories in Poltava and returned to the collective only during harvest season.

The village first was organized as a single collective, later as two, and in 1932 was divided again into three collectives. The president of the Red Star collective was elected at that time for a term of three years and, in 1936, had served the first year of his second term. The reelection of officers of collectives appears to be general, although in theory the practice is discouraged.

The principal problem of the collective since its organization has been capital construction. At the time of organization it had almost no stables, barns or other community buildings—a characteristic lack. In 1936, the collective borrowed 35,000 rubles from the state for new construction, and 65,000 rubles, out of the farm's estimated gross income of 200,000 rubles,

were earmarked for further construction, electrification, building of a large fish pond and purchase of a truck and light car.

Total acreage in collectivized land was 4,991 acres, sown principally in winter wheat, oats and rye. The establishment also had two orchards and melon patches which, in the two preceding years, had produced successful cash crops, although at the time of our visit they had been seriously affected by the drought.

The Red Star collective farm was unusual in that it owned 17 varieties of light farm machinery. It depended on the nearest Machine-Tractor Station (MTS) for all heavy and motorized machinery, but had a good many more rakes, harrows, ploughs and hand tools than we found on other farms. Some progress also had been made in electrification. The farm owned a dynamo engine, used to run MTS threshing machines. It also used electric current to operate a small flour-mill and forty-two homes had electric lights.

By the use of MTS tractors, ploughs and other machinery this collective was able to finish spring sowing in eight days, and hence had most of the seed in the ground before the drought began. This was a factor of considerable importance in production of a good crop in spite of the weather. In addition, MTS machinery was used for the following: plowing 1389 acres; cultivating 1334 acres; dragging 1892 acres; harvesting by combine 544 acres.

During the harvest of 1936 in the Ukraine about one-fourth of all of the grain on collectives was harvested by combines. The smaller proportion on the Red Star collective was due to the fact that a part of the terrain would not permit use of combines. No resident member of the collective was a qualified combine operator, and only two were tractor drivers, so that labor as well as machinery was provided by the MTS. This service was paid for in grain. The estimated payment was 8,043 bushels, approximately equal to the state grain levy of 8,737 bushels, or a total of 16,779 bushels out of an estimated gross yield of 79,491 bushels.

The state grain levy was paid for at the rate of 2.86 rubles per bushel. Most of the remainder of the grain was distributed to members as pay, but it was estimated there would be a small

surplus to be sold on the open market, where the price was about 4.08 rubles per bushel.

The Machine-Tractor Station, of which there were about 1,000 in the Ukraine, is an important instrument for government control over agriculture, and it also shares an educational function with the local agent of the Commissariat of Agriculture. Although only two resident members of this particular farm were qualified tractor drivers, and none had learned to drive a combine, seven young men from the farm were attached to the nearest MTS. Men from the MTS also gave lectures, distributed pamphlets and tried in other ways to instruct the farms in their district in improved technical methods. On every farm one large building was set aside as the offices of the collective, with a room where pamphlets and agricultural tracts were kept, a small laboratory was maintained, and the members were brought together to hear talks by the agent from the Commissariat of Agriculture or a man from the MTS.

Livestock

Replenishing the herds of livestock has been a serious problem. When the collectivization drive began, recalcitrant peasants killed thousands of cattle, sheep and horses rather than relinquish them to the collectivized herds. As the peasants who opposed collectivization were the ones who owned the largest quantity of livestock, the result was to create a very serious shortage. It was still acute in 1936 and it was a rare farm which had a sufficiency of animals, either for work or for produce.

The Red Star collective had 184 horses (119 work horses), 50 cows and 6 young bulls, and 178 pigs (2 boars, 40 sows). The horses showed fewer signs of hard usage than those on some other farms. They were well fed, and few at work in the fields had open sores—a common sight even on some of the German farms where the care for animals is supposed to be superior to that among the Russians. The farm owned two stallions, one purchased from a State stock farm for 10,000 rubles and the other bred on the place. Whether the purchase of a stallion under the conditions was good economy might be questioned. Any collective could rent a stallion for the season from a State farm, paying only for upkeep and a stud fee of

5 rubles. The hog was at that time an exceptionally pampered animal in the Ukraine as an emergency source of meat. The Swine Institute at Poltava was considered an important institution, and all collectives gave considerable attention to raising pigs.

The amount of livestock, as well as the amount of land, which may be owned privately by members of collectives is fixed by law, and varies in different regions. In the Ukraine, each member household could own a cow and calf, pigs, chickens, etc., but no horses. The number of pigs and cows owned in this way often exceeded the number in the collective farm herd. On the Red Star farm, each household had at least one pig and only 92 of the 370 households did not have a cow. The ownership of land is limited to two and a half acres (one hectare) per household. On this and other farms in the Poltava region, the household plot usually was sown in sunflower seeds, potatoes and cabbage.

Cultural Services

Farm buildings, machinery and livestock, making up the technical appurtenances of a collective, are supplemented by what may be called the cultural innovations. On the Red Star farm these were a nursery, a *patronat*, a motion picture machine and screen, and a cottage equipped as a lying-in ward. Schools, bathhouses and stores served the entire village. There also were two churches, one used as a granary, the other as a church.

The *patronat* is an unusual feature of collectives in the Ukraine, a product of the famine of 1931-32. It is an orphanage for children whose parents died or abandoned them during those years. The Red Star *patronat* took care of 31 children between five and sixteen years old. They were housed, fed and clothed there until they were ready to become members and go to work at sixteen.

The cinema, radio and travelling theatre are instruments in constant use in the Soviet effort to terminate the cultural isolation of the rural districts. The motion picture machine, which cost the farm 2,500 rubles, was set up in a hall which could be converted into a theatre whenever any of the numerous travelling theatrical troupes pay the farm a visit.

The maternity ward on the Red Star farm was inferior to those on most of the farms visited, lacking in cleanliness and full of flies. It was in a four-room cottage, one room used for beds, another as delivery room, a third as a laboratory, and the fourth as combined kitchen and bath. At the time of our visit, the law prohibiting abortions had just been passed, but this was a question of less interest to peasant women than to those in cities. At one farm we discovered an elaborate diagram of birth control instruments on a wall of the maternity clinic, but the nurses in charge insisted nobody ever had asked for advice on the subject in the two years she had been there. As a matter of fact improved economic conditions were affecting the birth rate. On the Red Star farm there were 64 births in 1935, and 58 in the first seven months in 1936.

Income

The working members of collectives, of course, are paid a share of the collective production, based on the number of work-days during the year. However the unit of measurement of a work-day is not the number of hours of work, but the type of task performed. The regulations as to what constitutes a work-day are drawn up by the board of each collective and approved by its members, and may vary to some extent, but on the whole they follow the general lines laid down by the All-Union Commissariat of Agriculture in Moscow. The pertinent section of Article 15 of the regulations for collectives reads:

"All types of work in a collective farm, depending on qualifications required of the worker, nature and importance of the work, are divided into seven groups. For the fulfillment of simple and easy labor a collective farmer receives one-half a work-day for fulfillment of the daily norm. For the fulfillment of a daily norm of more complicated work he gets two work-days. Tractor drivers receive three work-days for their daily work and more complicated and responsible categories of work under the progressive piece-work system are valued at four work-days. Thus a work-day is the unit for measuring the quantity and quality of labor put in by a collective farmer in collective labor . . . a work-day is not a unit for measuring time of work. The number of work-days earned by each collective farmer is determined by the quantity and quality of labor he has done. Inasmuch as the entire income is distributed only in accordance with work-days, the number of work-days an individual has earned determines his share in the income to be distributed.

For example, if a collective farm has earned 50,000 work-days and a given collective farmer has earned 500 work-days, he is entitled to one one-hundredth of the total income."

In 1936 the Red Star collective pay per work-day was as follows: 3.5 rubles in cash, 11 lbs. of grain, 8.8 lbs. of potatoes, cabbages or other vegetables and fodder for stock as needed. The work-day pay the preceding year had been: 1.7 rubles in cash, 8.2 lbs. of grain, and 6.6 lbs. of potatoes and vegetables. Here, as elsewhere, the improved rate of pay was beginning to raise a problem. In households of three or more members, since it no longer was necessary for all members to work in order to get enough to eat, there was a tendency for one or more members, usually the wife or a young son, to spend less time at collectivized work and more at home, working in the household plot and tending the family livestock.

A Family Budget

Some of the changes which have been made in peasant life in the Soviet Union are obvious. If all of them are not entirely due to collectivization, at least they have spread more rapidly than in other countries because of the intensity of the drive for collectivization. They have been the introduction of machinery, some diversified farming and general improvement in agricultural technique; the development of brigade work, implying a planned division of labor, and the introduction of such new objects of community interest as the agricultural laboratory, the cinema, radio and theatre.

Normally it might be expected that a study of household budgets would be a reflection of these changes as they affected individuals. The difficulty is in first catching the hare. Few peasant families kept detailed budgets, and fewer were willing to discuss the subject so long as the feeling remained that private property was liable to arbitrary seizure. We attempted to get information by conversation with peasants, by inspection of the books of collectives, and by a combination of the two. No method produced satisfactory results.

The information gathered at the Red Star collective, which was visited early on the tour, was meager on this subject. More illuminating material was gathered at other farms, and a speci-

men budget from a collective near Odessa is offered as a substitute. The conditions it reflects differ from those at the Red Star farm principally in that the cash return was higher, owing to the government subsidy for cotton in the south, and the return in grain, vegetables, etc., somewhat lower.

The household had five members, a grandmother and grandchild who were not counted as workers, and a son, daughter and son-in-law. When we began to ask about the family budget, the grandmother accused us of being tax agents. The younger people saw the point and assisted us in making an approximate budget.

The sources of income were: 850 work-days (total for three workers) at 7.34 rubles per work-day, totaling 6,239 rubles; 1,500 rubles for renting part of the house to a family from Odessa during the summer; 2,000 rubles made by the son when working on the railway during winter.

While we made up the list of expenses, the grandmother complained frequently that the young people spent too much, and the son replied that "in our Soviet economy money is made to be spent." A similar conflict in ideas between generations was noticeable at other places where such inquiries were made.

The expenses for this household were: a gold tooth for the daughter, 1,000 rubles; alloy tooth for the son, 300 rubles (both protested, especially by the grandmother); radio crystal set, 171 rubles; sewing machine, 120 rubles; two suits of clothes and dress material, 1,400 rubles; two pairs good shoes, 500 rubles; bicycle, 300 rubles; motion pictures, clubs, trips to town and other amusements, 1,500 rubles; state bonds 500 rubles; taxes, 1,000 rubles; repairs to house 1,000 rubles; water pipes 500 rubles. Total receipts 9,739 rubles, and expenses 8,290.

The discrepancy between prices of sewing machine and shoes was checked and found to be accurate. The figures given above made no mention of any income from sale of a surplus of grain, vegetables, etc., received from the collective, or from sale of produce grown on the household's own plot. The son and daughter said some of the surplus had been sold. The grandmother insisted the family had eaten it all.

THE MAN OF EIGHTEEN SYMPHONIES

By

NICOLAS SLONIMSKY

Nikolai Miaskovsky is the only contemporary composer who writes symphonies in such numbers that comparison with the prolific eighteenth-century composers is prompted. Ever since Beethoven, nine has been considered the limit of numerical achievement in writing symphonies. It is said that prolific romantic composers such as Bruckner and Mahler had a superstitious feeling about exceeding the number nine and felt that the composition of a tenth symphony would be interrupted by death. Miaskovsky, living in a country where superstitions are not in vogue, has gone merrily along, and his Symphony No. 18 was performed in Moscow on October 1, 1937. There is every reason to believe that this is not Miaskovsky's last symphony.

Miaskovsky is a symphonist by nature. A glance over the list of his compositions reveals no operas, oratorios, ballets, or any other type of applied form. But it does not mean that Miaskovsky creates in terms of "absolute" music. Every one of his symphonies has an implied program, and he may well be called a true romantic composer, a Mahler of Russia. His symphonic cycle is naturally divided into three periods, six symphonies in each. The first period from the First to the Sixth Symphony is typical of his pre-revolutionary moods, introspective and at the same time mystical. The Sixth Symphony is the culminating point of these individualistic moods, although it was conceived in 1922 when Miaskovsky began to revise his intellectual outlook in the direction of a more realistic scheme of composition. In his extraordinarily frank "Autobiographical Notes," published in the June 1936 issue of *Sovetskaia Muzyka*, he writes concerning this period:

"Despite my instinctively correct ideological direction, the absence of a theoretically confirmed intellectual outlook produced in me a neurotic and sacrificial conception of the revolution and the then raging civil war; this state of mind naturally found its reflection in the first sketches of the Sixth Symphony which I conceived about that time. The first impulse was given to me by the singing of the French revolutionary songs "Ca Ira" and "Carmag-

nole" by a French artist who sang them exactly as they do in the workers' districts of Paris. I made notes of his version, which was different from the printed versions, and I was particularly impressed by the rhythmic energy of "Carmagnole." When in 1922 I started my Sixth Symphony, these themes naturally found their place in the symphony. The confused state of my world outlook at that time had inevitably resulted in a conception of the Sixth Symphony which sounds so strange to me nowadays, with the motives of a "victim," "the parting of the soul and body," and a short apotheosis symbolizing "beatific life" at the end; but the creative ardor of this symphony which I felt during its composition makes this work dear to me even now. Apparently, it still has a power to move the listener, as far as I can judge from performances here and frequent hearings abroad, particularly in America."

Miaskovsky's second symphonic period, from the Seventh to the Twelfth Symphony, symbolizes a path from the "subjective" to the "objective," or, in other terms, from the individual to the collective. Without trying to be literal in programmatic descriptions of the life in the Soviet Union of that period, he nevertheless went for inspiration to the fields and factories of the country. Between symphonies he tried his hand at mass songs, among which the "Wings of the Soviets" and the "Lenin Song" are the more successful. In the autumn of 1931, he conceived the plan of the Twelfth Symphony, known also as the "Collective Farm Symphony," although this subtitle is not used by Miaskovsky himself. The inception of this symphony coincided with the first plans for collectivization of agriculture, an idea which appealed to Miaskovsky as having definitely symphonic material in it. The three movements of the symphony symbolize three stages of collectivization: the old order, the struggle for the new plan, and the accomplishment of the plan.

The third period of Miaskovsky's symphonic cycle, from the Thirteenth to the Eighteenth Symphony, represents a synthesis of subjective moods and the objective realistic ideas. Miaskovsky himself considers his Thirteenth Symphony a highly pessimistic work. "This Symphony," he states, "was the result of an insuperable urge to find an outlet for the accumulated subjective moods," which, he bitterly adds, "have always been in my make-up, and are ineradicable at my age."

Thanks to this emotional discharge, in the following Fourteenth Symphony, Miaskovsky succeeded in creating a dynamic

and stimulating work. The Fifteenth Symphony is lyrical, but its lyricism is not somber, and its directional impulse is optimistic. Still nearer to the contemporary ideals are the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Symphonies. Finally, the Eighteenth Symphony is a joyful symphonic postscript, a summing up of materials stored up at an earlier date, with themes and melodies of a general Russian type, in mass-song style.

Despite this enormous symphonic output, Miaskovsky is still searching for a musical language which would completely satisfy him. He writes in his "Autobiographical Notes":

"The language of these symphonies is not the language that I should like to use in order to be a creator consonant with our times. I do not know what that language should be, and I have no recipe for it. Neither the utilization of our folk music nor the inflections of our city songs in their pure form seem to be the sole ingredients of a musical language of socialist realism in instrumental music, which latter differs greatly from the requirements of choral and other vocal music."

In order to understand Miaskovsky's creative evolution, it is necessary to know the circumstances of his early life. He was born April 20, 1881, in the fortress of Novo-Georgievsk, near Warsaw, and spent the first seven years of his life there. The only musical inclination he showed at that time was in the form of crawling under the piano when somebody played. Then the family moved to Orenburg and from there to Kazan. His first teacher was an aunt, a high-grade neurotic, who could hardly succeed in implanting a love for music. But musical impressions from the outside poured in, various summer operettas, and—Miaskovsky's first overwhelming musical experience—Glinka's "Life of the Tsar." Soon he entered the cadet school in Nizhny-Novgorod and then in St. Petersburg. He graduated in 1899 and was automatically pushed into a military career, traditional in his family. He selected the least obnoxious of the higher military schools, the Engineers' School. His musical studies continued under the tutorship of various teachers, but, on coming to Moscow, he finally decided to take up composition seriously. He wrote Rimsky-Korsakov in St. Petersburg, asking him to recommend a teacher in Moscow. Rimsky-Korsakov replied with a cordial letter, advising him to see Tanev.

Taneev looked over Miaskovsky's first attempts and turned him over to Glière, with whom Miaskovsky took an entire course in harmony in six months' time.

In 1904, Miaskovsky went to St. Petersburg. Glière recommended him to Kryzhanovsky, with whom he studied counterpoint, fugue, form, and a little orchestration. There he met the literary and musical modernists of that era and wrote his first serious works, songs to the texts of the poetess Z. Hippus. In these songs Miaskovsky already established his characteristic style, free tonality and a subtle rhythmic melodic line. Finally, he entered the St. Petersburg Conservatory and joined the classes of Liadov in counterpoint and Rimsky-Korsakov in orchestration. At that time he already showed that he was modernistically inclined. In 1908 he received a scholarship, and, in 1911, graduated from the conservatory, a full-fledged composer. Among his classmates were Serge Prokofiev, Boris Asafiev, and Lazare Saminsky.

During the world war, Miaskovsky was mobilized and was on the front lines during the retreat of the Russian army. After the October Revolution, he went to Moscow and in 1921 became a professor at the Moscow Conservatory. He has remained in Moscow ever since.

LIST OF WORKS OF NIKOLAI MIASKOVSKY

<i>Opus Number</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>No. of Movements</i>	<i>Date of Composition</i>	<i>First Performance</i>	<i>Published</i>
op. 1	Songs to Baratinsky's words	6	June, 1907		State Publishing House, 1922
op. 2	Songs to the words by Hippus	9	1904, 1905, 1906		State Publishing House, 1922
op. 3	First Symphony	3	fm. May to 9 Aug., 1908; Orch. 21 Sept., 1908	2 June, 1914, Pavlovsk	State Publishing House, 1929
op. 4	Songs to the words by Hippus	3	1905, 1906, 1908	31 Dec., 1908 St. Petersburg	Edition Russe de Musique, 1913
op. 5	Songs to the words by Hippus	4	1904, 1905, 1906, 1908		Jurgenson, 1912-1915. State Publishing House, 1921. Edition destroyed by composer.
op. 6	First Sonata for Piano in D minor	4	1907-1909		Jurgenson, 1912. State Publishing House, 1924. Universal Edition, 1925
op. 7	Songs to the words by Balmont ("Madrigal")	5	1908, 1909		
op. 8	Songs to the words by (1) Tiuchev (2) Viacheslav Ivanov	1 3	1909 1908		Edition Russe de Musique, 1910 Edition Russe de Musique, 1913 Universal Edition, 1925
op. 9	"Silence," symphonic poem after Edgar Poe	1	June to 17 Oct., 1909; Orch. 20 Feb., 1910	13 June, 1911, Moscow	manuscript
op. 10	Sinfonietta for small orchestra, A major	3	17-28 Dec., 1910; Orch. 18 July to 16 Aug., 1911	Pavlovsk	
op. 11	Second Symphony C sharp minor	3	I. completed 30 Sept., 1910; II. & III., 5 July, 1911; Orch. 22 Dec., 1911	24 July, 1912, Moscow	State Publishing House, 1928

<i>Opus Number</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>No. of Movements</i>	<i>Date of Composition</i>	<i>First Performance</i>	<i>Published</i>
op. 12	Sonata for cello and piano in D major	2	July, 1911	Feb., 1914, Moscow	Jurgenson, 1913. State Publishing House 1924
op. 13	Second Sonata for Piano F sharp minor	1	Winter of 1912		Jurgenson, 1913. State Publishing House, 1924.
op. 14	"Alastor," symphonic poem after Shelley	1	Completed 13 Nov., 1912; Orch. 6 Feb., 1913	18 Nov., 1914, Moscow	State Publishing House, 1922. In new edition, title is <i>Symphonic Poem</i> (1931)
op. 15	Third Symphony A minor	2	Completed March, 1914; Orch. July, 1914	27 Feb., 1915, Moscow	State Publishing House, 1927
op. 16	Songs to the words by Hippus	6	Oct., 1913, Jan., 1914	Feb., 1914	Jurgenson, 1915. State Publishing House, 1921. Universal Edition, 1928.
op. 17	Fourth Symphony E minor	3	2 Jan., 1918-5 April, 1918; Orch. in summer of 1918	8 Feb., 1925, Moscow	State Publishing House, 1926
op. 18	Fifth Symphony D major	4	2 Jan., 1918-5 April, 1918; Orch. in summer of 1918	18 July, 1920, Moscow	State Publishing House, 1923
op. 19	Third Sonata for Piano C minor	1	Winter of 1920		State Publishing House, 1923
op. 20	Songs to the words by Alexander Blok	5	Winter of 1921		State Publishing House, 1922
op. 21	Songs to the words by Tiuchev	2	Spring of 1922		State Publishing House, 1923
op. 22	Songs to the words by Delvig	8	3 Jan., 1926		State Publishing House, 1926
op. 23	Sixth Symphony E flat minor	4	fm. April, 1921-10 Aug., 1922; Orch. 3 July, 1923	4 May, 1924, Moscow	Universal Edition, 1925
op. 24	Seventh Symphony B minor	2	10-20 Aug, 1922; Orch. Dec., 1922	8 Feb., 1925, Moscow	Universal Edition, 1926
op. 25	"Fancies" for Piano	6	Sketched 1917; Composed 1922		State Publishing House, 1923

<i>Opus Number</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>No. of Movements</i>	<i>Date of Composition</i>	<i>First Performance</i>	<i>Published</i>
op. 26	Eighth Symphony A major	4	1 Sept., 1924; Orch. 29 June, 1925	23 May, 1926, Moscow	Universal Edition, 1927
op. 27	Fourth Sonata for Piano C minor	3	4 Jan., 1925		Universal Edition, 1925
op. 28	Ninth Symphony E minor	4	9 Sept., 1926; Orch. 21 July, 1927	29 April, 1928, Moscow	Universal Edition, 1928
op. 29	"Souvenirs" for Piano	6	Sketched 1907. Opus completed 25 July, 1927		Universal Edition, 1928
op. 30	Tenth Symphony F minor	1	29 April, 1927; Orch. 29 Dec., 1927	7 April, 1928 Persimfans, Moscow	State Publishing House, 1929
op. 31	"The Yellowed Pages" for Piano	7	Sketched 1906, 1907, 1917; Composed July, 1928		State Publishing House, 1930
op. 32	No. 1, Serenade for small orchestra in E flat major No. 2, Sinfonietta for string orchestra in B minor No. 3, Lyric Concertino for small orchestra in G major	3 3 3	15 Dec., 1928— Orch. 24 June, 1929 14 Jan., 1929 Orch. 24 June, 1929 24 Jan., 1929; Orch. 11-20 May, 1929	7 Oct., 1929 Persimfans, Moscow May, 1930, Moscow 7 Oct., 1929 Persimfans, Moscow	State Publishing House, 1930 State Publishing House, 1931 State Publishing House, 1930
op. 33	No. 1, String Quartet A minor No. 2, String Quartet C minor No. 3, String Quartet D minor	4 3 2	30 Jan., 1930 4 March, 1930 Winter of 1910	27 Nov., 1934, Moscow 19 Dec., 1930, Moscow 17 March, 1926, Moscow	State Publishing House, 1932 State Publishing House, 1932 State Publishing House, 1931
op. 34	Eleventh Symphony B flat minor	3	10 Sept. to 20 Oct., 1931; Orch. 19 March, 1932	16 Jan., 1933, Moscow	State Publishing House, 1934

<i>Opus Number</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>No. of Movements</i>	<i>Date of Composition</i>	<i>First Performance</i>	<i>Published</i>
op. 35	Twelfth Symphony G minor	3	12 Dec., 1931; Orch. 31 Jan., 1932	1 June, 1932, Moscow	State Publishing House, 1932
op. 36	Thirteenth Symphony B flat minor	1	29 May, 1933; Orch. 20 Oct., 1933	15 Nov., 1934, Chicago	manuscript
op. 37	Fourteenth Symphony C major	5	18 Aug., 1933; Orch. 11 Oct., 1933	24 Feb., 1935, Moscow	State Publishing House, 1937
op. 38	Fifteenth Symphony D minor	4	I. 21 July, 1933; II. 18 May, 1934; III. 17 Sept., 1934; IV. 15 Oct., 1934; Orch. 29 Nov., 1934	28 Oct., 1935, Moscow	State Publishing House, 1937
op. 39	Sixteenth Symphony F major	4	12 Oct.-21 Dec., 1935; Orch. 5 April, 1936	24 Oct., 1936, Moscow	manuscript
op. 40	Songs to the words by Lermontov	12	26 Dec., 1935- 24 Jan., 1936		State Publishing House, being published.
op. 41	Seventeenth Symphony G sharp minor	4	I. 19 Oct., 1936; II., III. & IV., from Jan.-11 Feb., 1937; Orch. from 14 April to 25 June, 1937 (piano score comp. 11 Feb., 1937)	17 Dec., 1937, Moscow	manuscript
op. 42	Eighteenth Symphony C major	3	21 July-14 Aug., 1937; Orch. 1-8 Sept., 1937	1 Oct., 1937, Moscow	manuscript

Compositions without opus number, printed, or manuscript (choral songs, marches, etc.), are not included in this list. All dates are given in new style. This list was compiled by Nikolai Miaskovsky for the author of the present article.

DOCUMENTS



On Payments to Italian Firms and Enterprises

Decree of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR

In view of the fact that payments to Soviet organizations in a number of commercial operations have been unwarrantedly unilaterally withheld by Italian firms and enterprises and that there is danger of the repetition of such withholding of payment in the future, and likewise in view of the fact that no answer has been received from the Italian Government in reply to the note of the Soviet Government, on this question, the Council of People's Commissars, in order to avoid the material loss to the USSR connected with this matter, decrees:

1. It instructs the Trade Delegation of the USSR in Italy and the economic organizations of the USSR which have payments owing to Italian enterprises and firms or will have payments to Italian enterprises falling due after the publication of this decree, including obligations, transferred to third parties, to deposit these payments temporarily, until special order, in the State Bank of the USSR in special accounts opened by the State Bank for these payments.

2. Until special order of the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR, no transfer of payments can be made from these accounts.

President of the Council of People's Commissars
of the USSR

V. MOLOTOV

Chargé d'Affaires of the Council of People's
Commissars of the USSR

N. PETRUNICHEV

January 14, 1938

On "The Call of the Stakhanovites of the Plants and Factories of Moscow and the Moscow District"

The Central Committee of the Communist Party Decrees

1. It explains that the "Stalinist month of Stakhanovite records" in preparation for January 1938, undertaken on the initiative of the Moscow Committee of the Communist Party and the December Meeting of the Stakhanovites of Moscow and the Moscow District, concerns only the Moscow District and not the whole USSR.

2. It is impossible to consider as the correct title for the proposed Stakhanovite month "The Stalinist Month of Stakhanovite Records,"

inasmuch as every special "week" or "month" of the Stakhanovite Movement should affect all Stakhanovites, and not only record makers, whose work makes up only the most insignificant part of the Stakhanovite Movement. Moreover the extension of the ranks of Stakhanovites during the special "weeks" or "months" should be considered one of the most important tasks, which unfortunately was overlooked in this instance by the Moscow Committee of the Communist Party and this call of the Stakhanovites of Moscow and the Moscow District.

3. It is impossible to consider the choice of January for the special Stakhanovite month a fortunate one, in view of the fact that January presents special difficulties of a seasonal character for a number of the most important branches of industry and transport—and especially since a very short time remains before the first of January to carry out the necessary preparations for the "month."

4. In connection with the fact that the Moscow Committee of the Communist Party undertook to carry through the Stakhanovite month without notifying the Central Committee of the Communist Party and without the consent of the interested Commissariats, the Central Committee points out to all District Committees, Regional Committees, Central Committees of the National Communist Parties the necessity of seeking the approval of the Central Committee of the Communist Party in such matters.

5. It recommends that the Moscow Committee of the Communist Party postpone until March the special month for the Stakhanovite Movement in Moscow and the Moscow District.
December 28, 1937

(*Pravda*, December 29, 1937)

AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

Articles 22, 23, 26, 28 are amended to include new administrative subdivisions.

Article 29 is amended to read:

The White Russian Soviet Socialist Republic consists of the Vitebsk, Gomelsk, Minsk, Mogilevsk and Polesk Regions.

Article 49 is amended to include subtitle (o), reading:

Declares in certain localities or in the whole USSR martial law, in the interests of the defense of the USSR or the maintenance of social order or state security.

Article 70 is amended to read:

The Council of People's Commissars of the USSR is formed by the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and consists of:

The Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars

The Vice-chairmen of the Council of People's Commissars

The Chairman of the State Planning Commission of the USSR
 The Chairman of the Commission of Soviet Control
 The People's Commissars of the USSR
 The Chairman of the Committee of Arts
 The Chairman of the Committee on Higher Education
 The Chairman of the Administration of the State Bank

Article 77 is amended to include in the list of All-Union People's Commissariats:

Machine Building
 Navy
 Agricultural Stocks

Article 78 is amended, changing the name of the Commissariat of Internal Trade to the Commissariat of Trade.

Article 83 is amended to exclude from the Council of People's Commissars of the Union Republics the Representative of the Committee of Agricultural Stocks and to change the name of the People's Commissariat of Internal Trade to the Commissariat of Trade.

Statistics of Delegates to Supreme Council

	<i>Council of Union</i>	<i>Council of Nationalities</i>
Total Membership	569	574
Members of Communist Party	461	409
Per cent to total	81%	71%
Workers	247	218
Peasants	130	200
Communist Party Functionaries.....	32	88
Government Officials	78	161
Military Personnel	24	41
White Collar Workers	169	156
Women	77	110

Age Distribution

Under 20	5	8
21-25	34	50
26-30	73	114
31-35	134	158
36-40	140	115
41-50	183	102
51-60		20
Over 60		7

(*Pravda*, January 15, 1938)

Council of Union

Chairman—Andrei Andreevich Andreev

Vice-Chairmen—Trofim Denisovich Lysenko and Sultan Segizbaev

Council of Nationalities

Chairman—Nikolai Mikhailovich Shvernik

Vice-Chairmen—Chimnaz Abdul Ali kizy Aslanova and Aleksei Mikhailovich Levitsky

Presidium of the Supreme Council

Chairman—Mikhail Ivanovich Kalinin

Vice-Chairmen—

Ivan Sergeevich Khokhlov (RSFSR)
Grigori Ivanovich Petrovsky (Ukraine SSR)
Nikifor Yakovlevich Natalevich (White Russian SSR)
Mir Bashir Fardakh ogly Kasumov (Azerbaijani SSR)
Filipp Yesevich Makharadze (Georgia SSR)
Matsak Petrosovich Papian (Armenia SSR)
Khivali Babaev (Turkmen SSR)
Yuldash Akhunbabaev (Uzbek SSR)
Munavar Shagadaev (Tadzhik SSR)
Nurbapa Umurzakov (Kazakh SSR)
Murat Salikhov (Kirgiz SSR)

Secretary—Aleksandr Fedorovich Gorkin

Members of the Presidium—

Mir Dzhafar Bagirov
Lavrenti Pavlovich Beria
Vasilii Konstantinovich Bliukher [Bluecher]
Semen Mikhailovich Budenny [Budyonny]
Aleksei Alekseevich Volkov
Galei Dinmukhametov
Andrei Aleksandrovich Zhdanov
Yulii Moiseevich Kaganovich
Aleksandr Vasilevich Kosarev
Nadezhda Konstantinovna Krupskaya
Georgii Maksimilianovich Malenkov
Petr Georgevich Moskatov
Klavdiya Ivanovna Nikolaeva
Aleksei Nikolaevich Petrovsky
Ivan Ivanovich Sidorov
Iosif Vissarionovich Stalin

Adil-Girei Takhtarov
Semen Konstantinovich Timoshenko
Aleksandr Ivanovich Ugarov
Ivan Fedorovich Fedko
Nikita Sergeevich Khrushchev
Pakhim Kireevich Ibragimov
Matvei Fedorovich Shkiriakov
Usman Yusupov

Council of People's Commissars

Chairman—Viacheslav Mikhailovich Molotov
Vice-Chairmen—Vlas Yakovlevich Chubar
 Anastas Ivanovich Mikoian
 Stanislav Vikentevich Kosior
Chairman of the Commission of Soviet Control—
 Stanislav Vikentevich Kosior
Chairman of Gosplan—Nikolai Alekseevich Vosnesenski
Commissar of Foreign Affairs—Maksim Maksimovich Litvinov
Commissar of Internal Affairs—Nikolai Ivanovich Ezhov
Commissar of Defense—Kliment Efremovich Voroshilov
Commissar of Navy—Petr Aleksandrovich Smirnov
Commissar of Heavy Industry—Lazar Moiseevich Kaganovich
Commissar of Machine Building—Aleksandr Davidovich Bruskin
Commissar of Defense Industry—Mikhail Moiseevich Kaganovich
Commissar of Food Industry—Abram Lazarevich Gilinsky
Commissar of Light Industry—Vasilii Ivanovich Shestakov
Commissar of Timber Industry—Mikhail Ivanovich Ryzhov
Commissar of Railroads—Aleksei Venediktovich Bakulin
Commissar of Water Transport—Nikolai Ivanovich Pakhomov
Commissar of Communications—Matvei Davidovich Berman
Commissar of Agriculture—Robert Indrikovich Eikhe
Commissar of State Grain and Livestock Farms—
 Tikhon Aleksandrovich Yurkin
Commissar of Agricultural Stocks—Mikhail Vasilevich Popov
Commissar of Finance—Arsenii Grigorevich Zverev
Commissar of Trade—Mikhail Pavlovich Smirnov
Commissar of Foreign Trade—Evgeni Denisovich Chvialev
Commissar of Justice—Nikolai Mikhailovich Rychkov
Commissar of Health—Mikhail Fedorovich Boldyrev
Chairman of the Administration of the State Bank—
 Aleksei Petrovich Grichmanov
Chairman of the Committee of Higher Education—
 Sergei Vasilevich Kaftanov
Chairman of the Committee on Art—Aleksei Ivanovich Nazarov

Miscellaneous Appointments

- V. K. Dereviansky—Ambassador to Finland
L. M. Galler—Chief of Staff of the Navy
N. S. Khrushchev—Acting First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine
D. S. Korotchenko—President of the Council of People's Commissars of the Ukraine SSR
P. N. Krapivintsev—Ambassador to Lithuania
Mamadali Kurbanov—Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the Tadzhik SSR
L. Z. Mekhlis—Head of the Political Administration of the Red Army
K. A. Mikhailov—Ambassador to Afghanistan
V. S. Molokov—Chief of the Civil Air Force
A. E. Nikitin—Head of the Division of Press and Publishing of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and member of the editorial collegium of *Pravda*
V. A. Nikonov—Ambassador to Norway
A. V. Nikolaev—Head of the Government Reserves
Murat Salikhov—Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the Kirgiz SSR
I. V. Sautin—Chairman of the Central Statistical Administration
Sultan Segizbaev—Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the Uzbek SSR
P. I. Smirnov—First Vice-Commissar of the Navy
A. I. Ugarov—Acting First Secretary of the Moscow Committee of the Communist Party
A. Y. Vyshinsky—Procurator of the USSR

New Theatrical Productions

- Brustein, A., *We Seven*.
Chekin, I., *A Night in September*.
Del, D., *The Third Verst*.
Finn, Konstantin, *Sons*.
Karasev, L. P., *Mayak the Terrible*.
Kataev, Valentin, *A Lone Sail Looms*.
———, *I, Son of the Working Class*.
Korneichuk, Aleksandr, *The Truth*.
Kron, A., *Our Weapon*.
Markish, Perets D., *The Ovadis Family*.
Nikitin, Nikolai N., *Apsheron Night (or Baku)*
Nikulin, Lev V., *Port Arthur*.
Ostrovsky, A. N., *Guilty Without Sinning*.
Perventsev, A. A., and N. P. Okhlopkov, *Kochubei*.
Pogodin, Nikolai, *The Man With a Rifle*.
———, *Gioconda*.

Rakhmanov, *Restless Old Age*. (film title, *The Baltic Deputy*.)
Rotko, Viktor, *Kubantsy*.
Shkvarkin, V., *Simple Girl*
Trenev, Konstantin A., *On the Banks of the Neva*.
Virta, N., *Land*.
Yanovsky, Y., *A Ballad of Britanka*.

New Operas and Ballets

Chisko, Oles, *The Armored Cruiser Potemkin*. (opera)
Dzerzhinsky, Ivan I., *The Soil Upturned*. (opera—sequel to *And Quiet Flows the Don*.)
Einatov, Khodza, *Revolt*. (opera)
Kabalevsky, Dmitri, *The Master of Klamsi*. (opera—based on Romain Rolland's novel, *Colas Breugnon*, Burgundian.)
Khrennikov, Tikhon, *Fury*. (opera)
Kreitner, Georgi, *The Death of Pushkin*. (opera)
Oransky, *Monsieur de Pourceaugnac*. (ballet—based on Moliere's comedy of the same name.)
Shaporin, Yuri, *The Decembrists*. (opera)
Shtreikher, L., *Women of the East*. (opera)
Stepanov, Lev, *Border Guards*. (opera)
Vassilenko, Serge, *Gypsies*. (ballet—based on Pushkin's poem of the same name.)

Music

Arapov, B., *Tadzhik Suite*.
Golubev, Evgeni, *Return of the Sun*. (Oratio)
Kachurov, *Life is Calling*. (Symphony)
Khachaturian, Aram, *Concerto for Piano*.
Miaskovsky, Nikolai, *Eighteenth Symphony*.
Prokofiev, Serge, *Songs of Today*. (Suite for Orchestra and Chorus.)
Shostakovich, Dmitri, *Fifth Symphony*.
Vasilyev-Buglai, *Lenin-Stalin*. (Choral Suite)

NEWS CHRONOLOGY



INTERNAL AFFAIRS

Agriculture

DECEMBER

- 5—It is predicted that the unusually large 1937 cotton crop in Central Asia will mean the complete elimination of the Soviet Union as a buyer of American Cotton.—*New York Herald Tribune* (6)
- 18—The Commissariat of Agriculture issues an order regulating the annual accounting to be carried out by the collective farms.—*Izvestia* (18)

JANUARY

- 1—An all-Union cattle census is taken.—*Pravda* (1)
- 11—*Sotsialisticheskoe Zemel'delie*, official organ of the Commissariat of Agriculture, criticizes Professor N. I. Vavilov, well-known geneticist, for the shortcomings of the work in seed selection being conducted in state selection stations which are under his jurisdiction.—*New York Times* (12)
- 22—Commissar of Agriculture Eikhe reports on the agricultural plan for 1938.—*Izvestia* (22)
- 28—The agricultural plan for 1938 is published.—*Izvestia* (28)

FEBRUARY

- 6—Cotton deliveries to the government up to January 25 totalled 2,477,287 tons.—*Daily Worker* (7)
- A decree is issued reorganizing the system for financing the machine tractor stations.—*Izvestia* (6)
- 14—A decree is issued granting privileges to members of collective farms working in the coal and peat industries.—*Izvestia* (14)

Arctic

North Pole Drifting Station

DECEMBER

- 7—Two hundred days after its establishment near the North Pole, the drifting station is approaching northeast Greenland and is now about 539 miles from the Pole.—*New York Times* (8)
- 19—The scientists on the drifting station sight Greenland.—*New York Times* (22)

JANUARY

- 4—Two special planes are being equipped for the rescue of the scientists and their records on the icefloe.—*New York Times* (5)

- 10—The small hydrographic vessel *Murmanets* sails from Murmansk for the Greenland Sea to study the ice conditions and if possible establish contact with the North Pole drifting station.—*New York Times* (11)

FEBRUARY

- 1—In a furious storm the icefloe on which the drifting station is located splits up, leaving the station on a floe measuring about 984 ft. x 656 ft. Rescue plans are immediately hastened.—*New York Herald Tribune* (2)
- 2—The icefloe further splits, leaving the drifting station on an ice-cake about 150 ft. x 210 ft. in area.—*New York Times* (3)
- 3—The icebreaker *Taimyr*, with a plane aboard, sails from Murmansk to rescue the scientists on the drifting station.—*New York Times* (4)
- 7—The icebreaker *Murman* sails from Murmansk to join the rescue operations.—*Daily Worker* (9)
- 9—The USSR's second largest icebreaker, the *Yermak*, with Professor Schmidt aboard, sails from Kronstadt for the rescue of the drifting station.—*New York Times* (10)
- 13—The icebreaker *Taimyr* reaches a point 20 miles from the drifting station and plans to blast its way through the intervening ice. The ship exchanges signals with the station by means of its searchlight and flares.—*New York Times* (14)
- 15—Pilot Vlasov in a plane from the *Taimyr* makes the first aerial reconnaissance for the rescue of the scientists. Due to poor visibility, he did not sight the station.—*New York Times* (16)
- 16—Pilot Vlasov from the *Taimyr* lands his plane at the drifting station, establishing the first physical contact since June 6, 1937. He then returns to the ship.—*Daily Worker* (17)
- 17—A hydroplane from the *Murman* is forced down in a snow storm, but the two pilots are rescued in a plane from the *Taimyr*.—*New York Herald Tribune* (18)
- 18—The *Murman* comes within sight of the drifting station, which is five miles away.—*New York Herald Tribune* (19)
- 19—The *Murman* and the *Taimyr* reach a point near the drifting station and take aboard the four scientists, their dog and all the records and equipment.—*New York Times* (20)

Search for Levanovsky

DECEMBER

- 2—Three planes of the Levanovsky rescue expedition, headed by Vodopianov, reach Moscow. Four planes commanded by Chukhnovsky remain at Rudolf Island. Vodopianov indicates that the Levanovsky party is given up as lost, but hope remains of finding

some wreckage drifting on the Arctic ice.—*New York Herald Tribune* (3)

JANUARY

- 15—Wilkins returns from his first long Arctic flight by moonlight in his search for the Levanevsky party. The total distance covered was 1420 miles. The plane was turned back at latitude 76 north, when heavy snow clouds interfered with visibility.—*New York Times* (16)
- 28—What is considered abnormally bad weather has prevented Wilkins from making more than one flight in search of Levanevsky's party during the January period of bright moonlight.—*New York Times* (29)

Miscellaneous

DECEMBER

- 5—Preparations are being made to fly 20 women and children and sick members of the crews to the mainland from three freighters caught in the ice while bringing supplies to Rudolf Island.—*New York Times* (6)
- 27—Authorities hint that a submarine expedition to penetrate the Arctic Sea to the vicinity of the Pole is being considered in connection with plans for future Trans-Polar flights.—*New York Times* (28)

JANUARY

- 1—Vodopianov, in an article entitled "A New Year's Dream," discusses the possibility of a Soviet expedition to the South Pole to begin in 1938 and to last for three years. It would set up a scientific station at the Pole and would make exploratory flights over the Antarctic continent.—*New York Herald Tribune* (2)
- 8, 9—Molokov is preparing an aerial expedition of three 4-engined planes and 1 scouting plane to take food and to remove all but skeleton crews from 3 icebreakers caught in the ice since mid-October near the New Siberian Islands in the eastern Soviet Arctic. The ships are the *Sadko*, *Malygin* and *Sedov*, which have drifted north with the ice about 250 miles in the last ten weeks and are now at latitude 78 north.—*Daily Worker* (10) and *New York Times* (9)
- 23—The steamer *Rabochy*, after having been caught in the ice of the Laptev Sea, is finally crushed by the ice and sunk. All the crew and valuable equipment was removed and put aboard a rescue steamer *Kamchadal* which was escorted through the ice by the icebreaker *Lenin*.—*Daily Worker* (31)

FEBRUARY

- 4—Molokov, a veteran of the rescue of the Cheliuskin expedition in 1934 and one of the pilots of the North Pole expedition in 1937 is named chief of all Soviet civil aviation. This organization has

been commissioned to investigate the possibility of establishing a regular air route to the United States by way of the Arctic.—*New York Post* (4)

Art and Music

JANUARY

28—The First Congress of the Trade Union of Art Workers meets.—*Moscow Daily News* (29)

FEBRUARY

9—Elections to the Central Committee of the Union of Art Workers are held.—*Izvestia* (9)

8—Five young Soviet pianists are to compete in the Ysaye Contest in Brussels.—*Moscow Daily News* (8)

22—The Leningrad Conservatory is given the Order of Lenin and some of its leading artists are decorated on the 75th anniversary of the founding of the Conservatory.—*Pravda* (22)

Aviation

DECEMBER

26—A dirigible flight is made from Moscow to Sverdlovsk.—*Moscow Daily News* (26)

JANUARY

12—A new passenger air line is opened between Krasnoiarsk and Dudinka.—*Izvestia* (12)

14—Captain Nikolai Evdokimov, who claimed the world's record for a high parachute jump of 26,575 ft., dies.—*New York Times* (15)

27—The International Federation of Aeronautics confirms the long-distance record of Gromov in the second Trans-Polar flight.—*Izvestia* (27)

FEBRUARY

4—Molokov is named chief of all the Soviet Civil aviation, succeeding Tkachev.—*Pravda* (4)

—The International Federation of Aeronautics grants Gromov the award for outstanding achievement in aviation during 1937.—*Pravda* (4)

6—The Soviet Union's largest dirigible, the V-6, crashes during a storm into a mountain on the Kola Peninsula, with the loss of 13 of its crew. It was on a test flight preparatory to taking part in the rescue operations for the North Pole drifting station.—*New York Herald Tribune* (8)

Campaign Against Wrecking and Espionage

DECEMBER

10—Fourteen persons accused of sabotage in the livestock industry are reported sentenced to death.—*New York Times* (11)

- 19—An article in *Pravda* condemns wilful slander against innocent persons which has resulted in their arrest and disgrace. The writer of the article urges that the courts act against these self-seeking betrayers of their fellow citizens.—*New York Times* (20)
- Eight former officials, among them Leo M. Karakhan and Avel Yenukidze, are executed on sentence of high treason by the Military Collegium of the Supreme Court.—*New York Times* (20)
- 23—Commissar of the Timber Industry, V. L. Ivanov, is reported removed from his position.—*New York Herald Tribune* (24)

JANUARY

- 3—Eight former Armenian officials are reported executed for treason.—*New York Times* (4)
- 10—Twenty-one bishops and priests are denounced in the Soviet press as saboteurs and terrorists.—*New York Times* (11)
- 13—Fifteen death sentences are announced in the Volga district and one in Karelia for wrecking activities in agriculture.—*New York Herald Tribune* (14)
- 16—Thirty-nine Kiev railway station employees are on trial charged with sabotage.—*New York Times* (17)
- 19—A decision of the Plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union calls for a halt to the indiscriminate charges against Party members.—*Pravda* (19)
- 31—Five former officials of the Georgian Institute for Research in Animal Husbandry, one collective farm official in Dagestan, and three railway employees in Siberia are sentenced to death for wrecking and sabotage.—*New York Herald Tribune* (Feb. 1)

FEBRUARY

- 21—Nine veterinaries are sentenced to death and five are given long prison terms at Ordzhonikidze for infecting and poisoning cattle in order to kill troops and civilians. It is claimed that 90,000 head of cattle have been killed by them since 1932.—*New York Herald Tribune* (22)
- 23—It is revealed that Admiral Orlov, former commander-in-chief of the Soviet Navy, and Admiral Sivkov, former commander of the Baltic Fleet, have been put to death for treasonable activities.—*New York Times* (24)
- 28—It is announced that twenty-one persons will go on trial in Moscow beginning March 2. They are accused of espionage, wrecking and plotting to overthrow the Soviet regime. Among them will be Rykov, Bukharin, Yagoda, Krestinsky, Rakovsky, Rozengolts and Grinko.—*New York Herald Tribune* (28)

Defense

DECEMBER

- 31—A People's Commissariat of Naval Affairs is established with Peter A. Smirnov as first commissar. This is considered to indicate a

move to make the Soviet navy a stronger arm of defense.—*New York Herald Tribune* (Jan. 1)

JANUARY

- 23—A Japanese press dispatch states that the USSR's Pacific squadron now has 90 submarines.—*New York Times* (24)
- 25—London reports state that the fortifications and shipbuilding activities of Leningrad are being greatly increased and that the district is to become a gigantic naval base. This is believed to be the reason for the removal of foreign consulates from Leningrad. (see under Foreign Affairs)—*New York Herald Tribune* (25)
- 29—Areas along the Soviet borders are reported to have been cleared of inhabitants for military reasons.—*New York Times* (30)
- 31—Tactical exercises of the Baltic fleet are held.—*Pravda* (31)

FEBRUARY

- 1—Commissar of Naval Affairs Smirnov states that the USSR's coast defenses have been tripled during the last five years and that the navy's old pre-war battleships have been modernized. He also reveals that the Pacific fleet is now commanded by a young officer, Kuznetsov.—*New York Herald Tribune* (1)
- 14—Reports indicate that the Red Army Air Corps' new chief is Commander A. D. Loktionov.—*New York Times* (15)
- 19—Bucharest newspapers report that the USSR is about to begin the construction of fortifications along the Russo-Rumanian frontier and that additional air bases and coast defenses will be built along the Black Sea Coast.—*New York Times* (20)
- 22—At a large meeting of Red Army men on the eve of the celebration of the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Red Army, Commissar of Defense Voroshilov says: "We are not blind to the lessons of the wars in Spain and China. We do not want war. We hate war. But if they force war upon us we shall not hesitate to fight them with every weapon at our command and fight them tenfold on their own ground. . . . The navy does not rank with the highest, but it is already adequate to defend Soviet shores. . . . Our aviation is as good as any, if not better. . . . Our infantry is not only well trained, equipped and disciplined, but every man in the ranks knows what he is fighting for and why. That is our strongest power, because morale in war counts equally with bayonets and cannon." In conclusion, he said: "The USSR wants peace, not war. It has no aggressive designs or intentions, but let its enemies realize that that is not a sign of weakness. If they attack, the USSR will not only defend itself, but will strike back with all its force."—*New York Times* (23)
- 22—In connection with the 20th anniversary of the Red Army and Navy, an amnesty is granted to all persons in military services serving sentences up to three years.—*Pravda* (22)

- 22—In connection with the 20th anniversary of the Red Army and Navy, jubilee medals are issued to those who served in the army for 20 years and to those who have been awarded the Order of the Red Banner for outstanding valor during the Civil War.—*Pravda* (22)
- 23—The USSR celebrates the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Red Army.—*New York Herald Tribune* (24)

Government

DECEMBER

- 5—Moscow celebrates the first anniversary of the adoption of the new Soviet constitution with festivities in many trade union halls, factories and clubs.—*New York Times* (6)
- 12—Ninety million Soviet voters go to the polls in the first secret balloting in the Soviet Union, to elect 1,143 delegates to the Supreme Soviet, as provided by the 1936 Constitution. It is reported that the elections were carried out in a very orderly fashion amid much festivity.—*New York Times* (13)

JANUARY

- 12—The first session of the Supreme Council, provided for in the 1936 Constitution, opens in Moscow.—*New York Times* (13)
- 19—The first session of the Supreme Council is adjourned, after electing its Presidium, the Council of People's Commissars, establishing committees, and amending the constitution in several details. (see p. 50 for details)—*New York Times* (20)

FEBRUARY

- 3—A decree is issued providing for the reorganization of the State Planning Commission.—*Izvestia* (3)
- 11—The Central Executive Committee of the RSFSR meets and adopts rules for the elections to the Supreme Council of the RSFSR, as provided in its new constitution.—*Izvestia* (11)
- 27—A decree is issued establishing a Committee on Construction under the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR to supervise the building industry in all branches of the national economy.—*Pravda* (27)

Throughout the month the Central Executive Committees of the Union Republics and of the Autonomous Republics met to adopt the rules for the election procedure under their new constitutions.

Industry

DECEMBER

- 3—Special efforts are being made to increase production in the last month of the second Five-Year Plan so as to reach the plan figures in as many industries as possible. A ten-day Stakhanovite drive is

launched to establish records before the coming elections on December 12th. Bonuses are to be given to heads of departments, foremen, chief engineers, mechanics and technicians for over-fulfillment of plan figures in their departments.—*New York Times* (3)

- 18—Increased output in heavy industries is urged as the major aim of the third Five-Year Plan. Banners and badges will be offered as rewards for increased productivity of labor in factories and plants in a "Stalin month of Stakhanovite records" to be inaugurated January 1, 1938.—*New York Times* (18)
- 29—The "Stalinist Month of Stakhanovite Records" planned for January, 1938, is postponed by order of the Central Committee of the Communist Party.—*New York Times* (29) (see documents section, p. 49)
- 31—Plan figures for the first year of the third Five-Year Plan are published for industry and transport. These call for a 84,300,000 ruble output in 1938, 15.3 per cent greater than the plan for 1937.—*New York Times* (1)

JANUARY

- 9—A decree is issued regulating the funds to be set aside by industry for amortization and repair work.—*Izvestia* (9)
- 30—Commissar of Heavy Industry Kaganovich issues an order on the 1938 plan for Heavy Industry and the measures to be taken to insure its fulfillment. The plan calls for an increase of 15 per cent in total production as compared with the 1937 plan.—*Pravda* (30)

FEBRUARY

- 27—A decree is issued reorganizing the construction industry.—*Izvestia* (27)

Theatre and Cinema

DECEMBER

- 17—Vsevolod E. Meyerhold is denounced by the All-Union Art Committee for producing plays that are incompatible with present Soviet standards. It is pointed out that the theatre-going public has been attending Meyerhold performances less frequently in recent months.—*New York Herald Tribune* (18)

JANUARY

- 8—The Meyerhold Theatre is ordered dissolved by the All-Union Art Committee. The actors are assigned to other theatre troupes and the new building which was under construction to house the Meyerhold theatre is being done over as a concert hall.—*New York Times* (8)
- 9—Boris Shumiatsky, head of the Soviet film trust, is censured for the general deterioration of the output of the film industry.—*New York Herald Tribune* (10)

FEBRUARY

- 27—Sergei Eisenstein arrives in Leningrad to begin production on a film called "Russ" which will deal with the exploits of Alexander, Duke of Novgorod, who fought off the Teutonic invaders in the 13th century and crushed their Swedish allies. This will be Eisenstein's first picture since his film "Bezhin Lug" was condemned as formalistic.—*New York Times* (28)

Miscellaneous Internal News

DECEMBER

- 5—The *Akademia* publishing house is merged with *Goslitizdat*.—*Literaturnaia Gazeta* (5)
- 10—A special course in journalism is established by the Central Committee of the Communist Party, to train provincial newspaper editors.—*Pravda* (10)
- 20—The twentieth anniversary of the founding of the Soviet political police is celebrated. Formerly the Cheka, later the OGPU, the police forces are now administered by the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs. Speeches delivered in connection with this celebration call on all working people to increase their revolutionary vigilance in helping to route out traitors.—*New York Times* (21)
- In connection with the anniversary of the political police, it is announced that the double-tracking of the Trans-Siberian has been completed and many of the workers rewarded.—*Pravda* (20)
- 22—Announcement is made of a program of large-scale construction of power-plants, canals, highways, and railways under the supervision of the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs.—*New York Times* (23)
- 17—On the fifteenth anniversary of the savings bank system of the Soviet Union, it was reported that 14,000,000 Soviet citizens have savings banks accounts, totaling 4,312,000,000 rubles.—*Pravda* (17)

JANUARY

- 8—The number of births in Moscow during the year 1937 is given as 135,848, which represents a tremendous increase over the previous year. This increase is probably reflected throughout the country.—*New York Times* (9)
- 16—A second dry-dock is nearly ready in Nikolaev to be towed to the Far East.—*Pravda* (16)
- 19—The Central Committee of the Communist Party adopts a stern resolution condemning mass expulsions of Party members and orders that members dismissed from their jobs, because of expulsion from the Party, be reinstated.—*New York Times* (19)
- 28—Announcement is made of the completion of the construction of

the foundation of the Palace of Soviets in Moscow. About 63,000 tons of concrete were used.—*New York Times* (29)

- 29—Procurator Vyshinsky reports that 25 per cent of the criminal cases brought to court in Moscow are without foundation and condemns the tendency to mass accusations.—*New York Times* (30)

FEBRUARY

- 2—A conference of Soviet lawyers and jurists meets.—*Izvestia* (2)
—The Plenum of the *Bezbozhniks* (Society of Militant Atheists) meets.—*Izvestia* (2)
- 3—It is announced that construction was started several months ago on a new railroad from the capital of Buriat Mongolia, Ulan Ude, on the Trans-Siberian Railroad, to Kiakhtha on the Outer Mongolian frontier, one of the principal points of entry from the Mongolian People's Republic.—*New York Herald Tribune* (4)
- 9—An order is issued by the Economic Council under the Council of People's Commissars of the USSR to prevent waste in the use of electric power in city lighting.—*Izvestia* (9)
—For the first time air-conditioning equipment is being provided in new railway cars.—*Pravda* (9)
- 5—Publication of the magazine *Bezbozhnik* (Atheist) is to be renewed.—*Pravda* (5)
- 11—A decree is issued standardizing and unifying the charges for telephone and telegraph service.—*Izvestia* (11)
- 14—A letter from Stalin in reply to questions from Komsomol Ivanov is published on an inside page in *Pravda*. This letter restates the Stalinist position as regards the building of socialism in one country and the final establishment of communism.—*Pravda* (14)
- 16—Phototelegraphic communications are opened between Moscow and Tbilisi.—*Pravda* (16)
- 21—The *Moscow Daily News* is merged with the weekly edition and will appear henceforth weekly as the *Moscow News*.—*Moscow Daily News* (21)
- 22—Two icebreakers and airplanes are sent to rescue 200 fishermen and 35 horses marooned on drifting ice in the Caspian Sea.—*New York Herald Tribune* (23)
- 24—The Communist Party publishing house, *Partizdat*, is abolished.—*Izvestia* (24)

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Border States in Europe

DECEMBER

- 3—There is an incident on the Polish border, when Polish border guards interfere with Soviet railroad employees.—*Izvestia* (3)
- 19—The USSR sends a note to the Polish Foreign Office accusing Pol-

- ish railroad officials of burning a Soviet train.—*New York Times* (20)
- 23—A Soviet-Lithuanian Trade Agreement is signed for 1938.—*Moscow Daily News* (23)

JANUARY

- 11—Mikhail Ostrovsky, for three years the Soviet Minister to Rumania, is recalled to Moscow, indicating that no successor will be named. Strained relations between the Soviet Union and the Goga Government are given as the cause for this step.—*New York Herald Tribune* (12)
- 19—Soviet border guards are killed on the Estonia border.—*Moscow Daily News* (25)
- 28—Poland agrees to regulate the relations at the border where the railway incidents have been occurring.—*Moscow Daily News* (28)
- 29—The Rumanian Ambassador to the USSR is recalled to Bucharest.—*New York Herald Tribune* (30)

FEBRUARY

- 9—A London dispatch reports the second clash in three weeks on the Estonian-Soviet frontier.—*New York Herald Tribune* (10)
- The USSR sends to the Rumanian government an emphatic protest over the disappearance of the Soviet Chargé d'Affaires Butenko.—*New York Times* (10)
- 16—A man claiming to be the missing Chargé d'Affaires Butenko arrives in Rome and publicly denounces Bolshevism and the Soviet Government. Soviet officials maintain that Butenko has been kidnapped or killed in Rumania.—*New York Times* (17)
- 17—Commissar of Foreign Affairs Litvinov officially denies the Rumanian version of the disappearance of Butenko and issues another protest, as all attempts of the Soviet Embassy in Rome to see the alleged Butenko are refused.—*Izvestia* (18)

Consulates, Foreign in the USSR

JANUARY

- 13—Great Britain informs the USSR that it is opposed to closing its consulate in Leningrad, as requested.—*New York Herald Tribune* (14)
- 23—Great Britain announces that British visas will be issued only at Leningrad, contrary to the Soviet request that the Leningrad consulate be closed.—*New York Herald Tribune* (23)
- 25—Turkey and the USSR each will close three of their consulates on the territory of the other country. Each will retain only one consulate.—*New York Times* (26)
- A report from Finland states that the USSR has asked that the Finnish consulate in Leningrad be closed.—*New York Times* (26)

- 28—Denmark agrees to close its consulate at Leningrad on April 1.
—*New York Times* (March 1)

Far Eastern Affairs

DECEMBER

- 17—The Japanese government protests to the Soviet Embassy in Tokyo against the alleged illegal detention of Japanese citizens by the Soviet Union and asks that immediate steps be taken.—*New York Herald Tribune* (18)
- 21—The Soviet Union renews its fishing agreement with Japan for one year. The Soviet press gives the signing of the Anti-Communist Pact by Japan as the cause for the delay in concluding the new agreement.—*New York Times* (22)
- 25—The Soviet authorities demand the release by Manchoukuo of a mail plane which lost its way while flying the Khabarovsk-Vladivostok line and landed in Manchoukuo.—*New York Herald Tribune* (26)
- 30—A TASS dispatch reports that the Soviet Union has been sending some war supplies to China and will continue to do so. It adds that the amount of supplies sent is insignificant compared to shipments from the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany and Italy.—*New York Herald Tribune* (31)

JANUARY

- 1—The Soviet Embassy buildings in Nanking are reported destroyed by fire.—*New York Herald Tribune* (2)
- 17—Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Council of the Union, Zhdanov, urges more determined action in dealing with the acts of provocation perpetrated by Japan and Manchoukuo.—*New York Times* (18)
- 20—A dispatch from Hankow reports that rapid progress is being made in the construction of a highway linking China with the USSR via Sinkiang (Chinese Turkestan).—*New York Times* (21)
—Dr. Sun Fo, chairman of the Chinese government's Legislative Council, is in Moscow.—*New York Herald Tribune* (21)
- 24—The Soviet Embassy in Hankow, China's temporary capital, is reported destroyed by fire.—*New York Times* (24)
- 27—Parcel post shipments between Japan and the USSR are temporarily suspended.—*Izvestia* (27)

FEBRUARY

- 8—The Japanese War Minister, Sugiyama, cites the Soviet Union's armament expansion as the reason for Japan's need to build up its armaments. He states that the USSR has 1500 airplanes in the Far East.—*New York Herald Tribune* (9)

- 22—A Soviet ship anchored in Hakodate Harbor has been forcibly boarded and detained by Japanese officials.—*New York Times* (22)

Foreign Trade

DECEMBER

- 5—It is predicted that the unusually large 1937 cotton crop in Central Asia will mean the complete elimination of the Soviet Union as a purchaser of American cotton.—*New York Herald Tribune* (6)
- 11—Trade figures in Washington indicate that the United States' exports to the USSR for October, 1937, totaled \$3,564,000 as against \$1,796,000 for the same month in 1936, while the United States' imports from the USSR were \$3,806,000 as against \$1,243,000 for October, 1936.—*New York Times* (12)
- 27—The Export Managers Club of New York announces its dissatisfaction with the conditions covering the shipment of goods to the USSR. It suggests that a standard order form, covering all types of merchandise and equipment, be drawn up, to eliminate most of the present friction.—*New York Times* (28)

JANUARY

- 8—Soviet officials in the United States refuse to accede to the demand of American exporters that a standard order form be prepared, on the grounds that American manufacturers are competing with European producers who accept order forms identical with those at present in use in the United States.—*New York Times* (9)

FEBRUARY

- 3—According to figures of the International Institute of Agriculture, the USSR exported 27,000,000 bushels of wheat in 1937, an amount second only to that exported by Canada.—*New York World Telegram* (3)
- 12—It is announced that 28 officials in the Foreign Trade Commissariat have been deprived of the right to sign contracts for the trusts they represent.—*New York Times* (13)
- 20—The Commissariat of Foreign Trade has placed increased orders abroad for cocoa, coffee and spices.—*Pravda* (20)
- 23—Wheat quotations in Chicago and Liverpool rise, allegedly because of large-scale wheat purchases by the USSR for shipment to Vladivostok. It is reported that Australia has sold the USSR about 70,000 tons.—*New York Herald Tribune* (24)

Italy

JANUARY

- 15—The Council of People's Commissars issues a decree barring further payments to Italy in settlement of its trade accounts because certain Italian firms and the Italian navy are refusing to pay their commercial debts to the Soviet Union.—*Pravda* (15)

- 20—In answer to the USSR's charge that Italy is in arrears on commercial payments, Italy states that the reverse is true and that the USSR owes Italy tens of millions of lire.—*New York Times* (21)
- 29—Soviet authorities charge the Italian government with exaggerating the USSR's debt to Italy which is stated to be only about \$925,000 and they also criticize Italy for failing to reply to the Soviet charge.—*New York Herald Tribune* (30)

FEBRUARY

- 5—The Soviet Government protests to the Italian Government against the seizure of Soviet funds in Italy to satisfy the claims of the Italian builders of the destroyer *Tashkent*. The USSR claims that this is a violation of the Soviet-Italian trade agreement.—*New York Times* (6)

United States, Affairs Concerning the

DECEMBER

- 11—Secretary of State Cordell Hull makes diplomatic representation to the Soviet Ambassador Troyanovsky on behalf of Donald Robinson and his wife, reported missing in Moscow.—*New York Times* (12)
- 14—It is revealed by the United States State Department that the missing "Robinsons" are travelling on fraudulent passports.—*New York Herald Tribune* (15)

JANUARY

- 4—Experimental tests of radio-telephone communications between Moscow and New York are being carried out during January.—*Pravda* (4)
- 7—The United States Embassy in Moscow delivers a formal note to the Soviet Foreign Office, asking information on Mrs. Ruth Rubens, American woman who disappeared on December 9, while travelling under the assumed name of Mrs. Donald Robinson.—*New York Times* (8)
- 13—Secretary of State Hull, in a personal interview with Ambassador Troyanovsky, again presses for information on Mrs. Rubens, believed under investigation as a spy in Moscow.—*New York Times* (14)
- 22—Soviet authorities refuse to permit U. S. Embassy officials to visit Mrs. Rubens until they have finished questioning her.—*New York Times* (22)
- 25—The U. S. State Department refuses to accept the USSR's denial of permission to interview Mrs. Rubens and considers further refusal as a violation of the Litvinov-Roosevelt agreements of 1933.—*New York Herald Tribune* (26)

FEBRUARY

- 5—Soviet authorities agree to let a United States diplomatic representative interview Mrs. Rubens.—*New York Times* (6)
- 10—The United States Chargé d'Affaires Henderson interviews Mrs.

(Continued on page 72)



**A SOVIET
STORY**
for
**AMERICAN
CHILDREN**
up to ten

THE ADVENTURES OF MISHA

By Sergei Rosanov

This simple and engaging story, translated from the Russian by Mrs. Maxim Litvinov, is about a little Soviet boy in Moscow who is lost and found again. It is a perfect book to draw children of two nations together in mutual laughter and understanding. The *New York Times* calls it: "A story with lively, natural conversation, convincing people, humor and action." **\$1.50**

F. A. STOKES CO.

NEW YORK

PAVLOV AND HIS SCHOOL

**The Theory of
Conditioned Reflexes**

By Y. P. FROLOV

This "absorbingly readable" biography of the great Russian physiologist, intimate and thorough, offers also new material about Pavlov's predecessors, about the evolution of, and applications of his theory of conditioned reflexes. Written by a former co-worker, it contains glimpses of day-by-day laboratory activity—details of actual experiments. *Illustrated.* **\$4.00**

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
114 Fifth Avenue **New York**

GENERAL EXHIBIT on the U.S.S.R.

Designed—Fall, 1937

BASED on the 1936 Constitution, this exhibit, which has just reached this country, covers all phases of life in the Soviet Union. Articles from the Constitution are quoted and then illustrated by charts and photographs.

The exhibit contains 54 panels, each 25" by 30". The material is divided as follows: 15 panels on government administration, 10 panels on the rights of citizens, 10 panels on the national economy, 3 panels on agriculture, 5 panels on labor, 4 panels on defense and 7 panels on the history of the revolution.

Minimum Fee for Two Weeks of Entire Exhibit, \$10.00 plus transportation costs
Minimum Fee for Two Weeks of Single Section, \$5.00 plus transportation costs

*For further information about this and other
exhibit material, please write:*

THE AMERICAN RUSSIAN INSTITUTE, Inc.
56 West 45th Street **New York City**

by *George Baidukov*

OVER THE NORTH POLE

Preface by Vilhjalmur Stefansson

GEORGE BAIDUKOV, one of the three Soviet aviators who flew the ANT-25 from Moscow to the United States in the first trans-Polar flight, tells the story of that flight in a breathless, personal narrative. Baidukov's account is homely and humorous, brief but complete. It carries one along at several miles a minute, and yet it manages to tell all the basic facts about the flight (from the moment when Stalin officially approved), to give a picture of his fellow aviators, to depict the perils and dangers of this pioneer adventure. Particularly interesting to American aviation enthusiasts is the incidental account of the way the Soviets run these things. Many will probably put this book down wondering how, in the name of Stalin, these fellows did it. With Baidukov were Chkalov and Beliakov, "Heroes of the Soviet Union" all. These three had previously flown the same ship on another record-breaking flight.

With 16 pages of illustrations, \$1.50

HARCOURT, BRACE AND COMPANY
383 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK

- Rubens, who makes no request for assistance from the State Department.—*New York Times* (12)
- 15—The suit of the Soviet government to recover \$1,000,000 from the National City Bank is dismissed by the New York Supreme Court. Although the money was deposited in 1918, the court holds that all Russian claims against American nationals were assigned to the United States government under the Litvinov agreement of 1933. *New York Times* (15)
- 23—United States Ambassador Davies returns to Moscow to stay until the late spring when he will take up his new post at Brussels. —*New York Herald Tribune* (24)

Miscellaneous Foreign Affairs

DECEMBER

- 2—The President of Tana Tuva visits Moscow.—*Izvestia* (2)
- 11—The German Foreign Office is officially notified that Konstantin Yurenev will not return to Berlin as Soviet Ambassador.—*New York Times* (12)
- 15—A. A. Troyanovsky, Soviet Ambassador to the United States, declares that the verdict of innocence reached by the Trotsky Defense Committee is only an effort to whitewash Trotsky.—*New York Herald Tribune* (16)

JANUARY

- 3—The Soviet-French provisional trade agreement is prolonged to December 31, 1938.—*Moscow Daily News* (3)
- 27—At the opening session of the League of Nations, Litvinov states that the League "may still serve as a great obstacle to the further unleashing of forces of aggression and in certain cases may help to arrest or restrain aggression."—*New York Times* (28)

FEBRUARY

- 14—The USSR is invited to attend the World Power Conferences to be held in London and Vienna.—*Moscow Daily News* (14)
- 17—The Ambassador from Iran denies the report that Persia, Turkey, Afghanistan and Iran are negotiating to amend the Four-Power Treaty between them to include an anti-Communist provision. —*Pravda* (17)
- Reports from Berlin indicate that measures are being taken by the German Government to remove from the country all Soviet citizens who are Jewish. There are about 1,000, representing 8 per cent of the Soviet citizens resident in Germany.—*New York Herald Tribune* (18)
- 18—P. G. Moskatov, one of the secretaries of the Soviet Central Council of Trade Unions, makes a speech at a Paris meeting, urging resistance to fascism and aid to the victims of aggression.—*Pravda* (21)
- Opinion in Moscow official circles considers that Eden's resignation and Great Britain's "capitulation" to aggressor nations has increased the danger of war.—*New York Herald Tribune* (22)